

# THE CLERGY REVIEW

A MAGAZINE FOR THE CLERGY

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

VOLUME IV, No. 2.

AUGUST, 1932.

Proprietors

"THE UNIVERSE,"

(Associated Catholic Newspapers, 1912, Ltd.)

1, Arundel Street, London, W.C.2

**PATRONS.**

His Eminence CARDINAL BOURNE,  
*Archbishop of Westminster.*

His Eminence CARDINAL MACRORY,  
*Archbishop of Armagh.*

Their Graces the ARCHBISHOPS OF CARDIFF, TUAM, CASHEL,  
BIRMINGHAM, AND ST. ANDREWS AND EDINBURGH.

**EDITORIAL BOARD.**

The Most Rev. RICHARD DOWNEY, D.D., Ph.D., LL.D.,  
*Archbishop of Liverpool (Chairman).*

The Presidents of the English Seminaries at home and abroad—  
Ushaw, Oscott, Upholland, Womersley; Rome (Venerable  
English College, and Collegio Beda), Valladolid, Lisbon,  
and the Joint Editors:

The Right Rev. BISHOP MYERS, M.A.,  
*Formerly President of St. Edmund's College, Ware.*

The Rev. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.,  
*Vice-President of St. Joseph's College, Upholland.*

With the collaboration of:  
The Right Rev. Mgr. CANON GEORGE, D.D., Ph.D.,  
and  
The Rev. JOHN P. ARENDZEN, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

TEXTUS ET DOCUMENTA. Series Philosophica. Volumes I and II. TEXTUS ET DOCUMENTA. Series Theologica. Volumes I to V. (Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, Rome, Piazza della Pilotta. 4 lire each.)

THE BLOOD OF CHRIST IN CHRISTIAN LATIN LITERATURE BEFORE THE YEAR 1000, by the Rev. Joseph Henry Rohling, S.T.L., of the Society of the Precious Blood. A Dissertation. (The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. pp. xxxii and 158.)

CONSPECTUS HISTORIÆ DOGMATUM ad Aetate PP. Apostolicorum usque ad Saec. 13. Two volumes. By the Rev. J. F. De Groot, S.J. (Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana. pp. 516 and 472.)

M. LOISY ET LE MODERNISME, A Propos des "Mémoires." Par le Rev. M.-J. Lagrange, des Frères Prêcheurs. (Les Editions du Cerf, Juvisy, Seine-et-Oise, France. pp. 250. 18 francs.)

DE RELATIONE JURIDICA INTER DIVEROS RITUS IN ECCLESIA CATHOLICA, by the Rev. Dr. Alexius Petrani. (Marietti, Turin. pp. 108. 6 lire.)

VITA CHRISTI, Meditations on Our Lord's Public Life for the time after Pentecost, by Mother St. Paul. The Third Year: Part I. (Longmans, Green & Co., London. pp. xii. and 157. 5s.)

MARIAGE ET NATALITE: Comptes-Rendus du Congrès de la Natalite de Bruxelles, 1931. (Brussels, Editions de la Cité Chrétienne. pp. 336. 20 Belgian francs.)

LA CROISADE EUCHARISTIQUE. Pédagogie et Résultats. Par Marie Fargues. (Les Editions du Cerf, Juvisy, Seine-et-Oise, France. pp. 55.)

VIE DE JESUS, par Pierre, Cardinal de Bérulle. Avec Préface et Notes du Rev. P. A. Molien. (Les Editions du Cerf, Juvisy. pp. xxviii. and 270.)

THE FRAMEWORK OF A CHRISTIAN STATE, An Introduction to Social Science, by the Rev. E. Cahill, S.J. (M. H. Gill & Son, Dublin. pp. xxvii and 701. 15s.)

SAINT PAUL, by Wilfred Knox. (Peter Davies, London. pp. 154. 5s.)

VOLTAIRE, by André Maurois. (Peter Davies, London. pp. 158. 5s.)

THE LIVES OF THE POPES IN THE MIDDLE AGES, by the Right Rev. Mgr. Horace K. Mann, D.D. The Popes at the Height of their Temporal Influence. Innocent II. to Blessed Benedict XI., 1130-1305. Volume XVIII: Boniface VIII to Blessed Benedict XI, 1294-1304. (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., London. pp. 491. 15s.)

COMPENDIUM SALMANTICENSE THEOLOGIAE MORALIS, auctore R. P. Fr. Antonio a Sancia Joseph, Carmelita Excalceato. Emendatum ac ad normam Codicis Juris Canonici accomodatum a R.P. Nicolae a P.C. Maria Ordinis Carmelitarum Discalceatorum alumno. (El Monte Carmelo, Apartado 19, Burgos, Spain. Two volumes. pp. 800 and 707. £1 for the two volumes.)

COLLATIONES THEOLOGICAE, auctore R.P. Armando Gougnard. Fasciculus Primus seu Adnotationes de Baptismo, Confirmatione, Justitia. (H. Dessain, Malines, Belgium. pp. 88.)

JUS MISSIONARIORUM, auctore G. Vromant, C.I.C.M. de Scheut. Tomus V: De Matrimonio. (Museum Lessianum, 11, rue des Recollets, Louvain, Belgium. pp. xiii. and 355. 40 francs.)

CASUS CONSCIENTIAE PROPOSITI AC SOLUTI, ab Eduardo Genicot, S.J. Opus Postumum accomodatum ad Theologiae Moralis Institutiones eiusdem auctoris. Editio Sexta ad normam Codicis Juris recognita et Pluribus Casibus aucta a J. Salsmans, S.J. (Museum Lessianum, Louvain. pp. 755. 45 francs.)

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, by the Rev. Fernand Mourret, S.S. Translated by the Rev. Newton Thompson, S.T.D. Volume One: Period of Early Expansion. (Herder, London. pp. xx. and 636. 21s.)

A BOOK OF BRITTANY, by S. Baring-Gould. Completely revised by Ivor Daniel. With many illustrations. (Methuen, London. pp. xvi. and 203. 7s. 6d.)

THE LOG-BOOK OF A DREAM-SHIP (or the Voyage of the "Tea-Cup") a Fairy Tale for Children, Old or Young, by Dorothy A. H. Mills. Illustrated by the Author. (Burns Oates & Washbourne, London. pp. 67. 3s.)

IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF A SAINT, and Other Sketches from Spain, by Helen Hester Colvill. (Burns Oates & Washbourne, London. pp. 218. 5s.)

SAINT PATRICK'S PURGATORY, A Record from History and Literature. Compiled by Shane Leslie. Illustrated. (Burns Oates & Washbourne, London. pp. xlvii. and 215. 21s.)

TRACTATUS DE PECCATIS ET VITIIS IN GENERE. Editio Quinta, by the Rev. Stephan Carton de Wiart. Dessain, Mal'nes. pp. 172. 13.30 Belgian francs.)

# CONTENTS

AUGUST, 1932

|   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| ARTICLES:—  |      |
| 1. " Clericalism " in Central Europe,<br>By C. F. MELVILLE . . . . .  | 85   |
| 2. Some Difficulties of the Day (2) Economic Dangers to World<br>Peace,<br>By the Rev. LEWIS WATT, S.J., B.Sc.Econ. . . . . | 98   |
| 3. Auxiliary Bishops in England Before the Reformation,<br>By the Rev. WALTER GUMBLEY, O.P., F.R.Hist.S. . . . .            | 110  |
| 4. The Interpretation of the Hexaemeron (Concluded),<br>By the Rev. E. F. SUTCLIFFE, S.J., M.A. . . . .                     | 123  |
| 5. Satisfaction,<br>By the Very Rev. T. CANON SHEEHAN . . . . .   | 130  |
| HOMILETICS:—  |      |
| By the Rev. H. E. CALNAN, D.D. . . . .  | 136  |
| NOTES ON RECENT WORK:—  |      |
| (1) Moral Theology and Canon Law,<br>By the Rev. E. J. MAHONEY, D.D. . . . .  | 145  |
| (2) Holy Scripture,<br>By the Rev. J. M. T. BARTON, D.D., L.S.S. . . . .  | 151  |
| (3) Church History,<br>By H. OUTRAM EVENNETT, M.A. . . . .  | 156  |
| MORAL CASES:—   |      |
| Deaf Mutes and Confession,<br>By the Rev. E. J. MAHONEY, D.D. . . . .   | 161  |
| ROMAN DOCUMENTS:—   |      |
| By the Rev. A. BENTLEY, Ph.D., M.A. . . . .   | 163  |
| BOOK REVIEWS . . . . .  | 166  |
| REVIEW OF REVIEWS . . . . .   | 170  |



# THE CLERGY REVIEW

## "CLERICALISM" IN CENTRAL EUROPE

By C. F. MELVILLE.

"CLERICALISM" as a political or politico-religious term is not in current use in this country, where there is no political party specifically representing Catholic interests. It is essentially a European, and more especially a Central-European term, expressing something which is traditional in the Danubian regions.

Even in France and Italy, where there are strong clerical influences, there are no clerical parties. In Italy, since the Lateran Treaties and the Concordat, the position of the Church in relation to the State and within the social structure is at once clearly defined and strongly entrenched. This situation, together with the fact that all political organization is in the hands of the Fascist Party, obviates the existence of a clerical political party. The last instance of such a party was the "Popular" party of Don Luigi Sturzo; but the *Popolari* were suppressed by Signor Mussolini. In France political clericalism exists to-day, as ever, but it is not associated with any specific political party. The vaunted Catholicism of the *Action Française* royalists should not be confused with clericalism. The *Action Française* group having incurred the disapproval of the Vatican, they are now anti-clerical.

But in Danubian Europe i.e., in Germany, Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Jugoslavia, Clericalism is a living political force, in many cases a definite political organism, complete with party organization and party press. In a number of instances these clerical parties are led by priests: as in the case of Dr. Kaas, of the German "Centrum" (Centre Party); Mgr. Seipel, of the Austrian Christian-Social Party; Mgr. Srámek, of

the Czech People's Party; Father Hlinka, of the Slovak People's Party; and Father Korochetz, of the Yugoslav (Slovene) Clerical Party.

Taking a very broad generalization, political clericalism in Central Europe combines a moderate conservatism with care for the interests of the workers. More often than not in these days it represents the elements of political stability and exercises a moderating influence which frequently holds in check the forces of extremism both of the Right and the Left.

This is exemplified by the case of the German Centre Party, of which the leader is Father Kaas and the most prominent lay political personality is Dr. Bruening. The Centre, whilst rejecting the purely materialistic aspect of the Social-Democratic politico-social creed, nevertheless has on occasion co-operated with the Social-Democratic Party for reasons of political expediency. Also, although moderately Conservative in general policy, both the Centrum and its Bavarian cousin, the Bavarian People's Party, include within their organizations a strong Catholic trade union movement.

Just before his fall from office, Dr. Bruening had incorporated in his governmental programme a number of reforms, in the interests of the workers, proposed by the Social-Democrats. It was largely because many of these reforms were inimical to the vested interests of the Junker-Militarist class that these latter succeeded in intriguing with President Hindenburg for the removal of Dr. Bruening.

Of particular interest is the fight which Dr. Bruening put up against the Nazi movement of Herr Adolf Hitler. Dr. Bruening resisted the Nazis, not because of any fundamental divergence of views on the question of external policy—upon which all German parties are virtually agreed in principle if not in method—but because of an almost unbridgeable gulf in matters of internal policy. The main reason why the negotiations between the Centre and the Nazis failed—and this failure resulted in even greater antagonism between them—was the absolute impossibility of reconciling many of the Hitlerist theories with the politico-social outlook of the Catholic Church. Indeed, the Vatican made it clear to Dr. Bruening that it had fundamental objections to the

pagan, materialistic and anti-social ideas which coloured so much of the Hitlerist ideology—ideas which bore a close resemblance to many of the ideas inherent in Marxism. The Holy See, being "above the battle" politically, objected to these ideas irrespectively of whether they emanated from Fascism or Communism.

To understand this situation it is necessary in the first place to appreciate the fact that Hitlerism is an amalgam of Right and Left, and that its politico-economic-social ideology is a sort of patch-work quilt of ideas by means of which Herr Hitler hopes to hold together in a common cause of agitation the diverse elements—from extreme Right to extreme Left—which make up the membership of his party. Amongst these ideas are certain theories which elevate the State above all human and spiritual organs, which give a philosophic sanction to force *qua* force, and which degrade the human dignity of the individual and the family unit (i.e., the Nazis doctrines include the reduction of woman to the function of producing future "race-pure" pagan Teutonic heroes). It is not difficult to realize that a movement of this kind would be anathema to a Catholic.

I am not suggesting for a moment that the German Centre Party acts solely from religious or clericalist motives. Quite obviously, it has its secular political aims and interests, entirely unconnected with Church considerations. But in cases such as those cited above—where practical politics touch upon matters of moment to the Church—the Centre Party will naturally remember that it has a Catholic background.

Dr. Bruening succeeded in keeping the equilibrium in Germany, and in pulling that country through the worst moments of crisis, perhaps as no other German politician could have done. He imposed enormous sacrifices on the German people (the famous quasi-dictatorial Bruening decrees) and he succeeded in doing so because he always took his own medicine. The people knew that he was quite disinterested; had no personal ambitions; he was completely devoted to duty; and himself gave the first example of personal sacrifice. A pious Catholic, he lived an almost ascetic life: occupying two modest rooms, and giving up a large part of his ministerial salary to the community. A quiet read, with an occasional cigar, was about the extent of the relaxation he permitted

himself in between Herculean bouts of work. He succeeded in practically saving Germany—"I was thrown down within sight of the winning tape," he declared when he was put out of office)—*because he governed by moral force*. This is why I believe that we shall hear more of Dr. Bruening—"two-thirds saint and one-third Prussian," as an intimate friend once described him—in German politics, although for the moment his political star is temporarily in eclipse.

When one comes to consider Clericalism in that Mittel-Europa which once formed the Hapsburg domains, the question necessarily becomes more complicated, because it is inevitably cut across by historic, national and racial considerations, and agile political propagandists are not slow to exploit religious questions for ulterior political motives.

Thus, in connection with the polemics regarding the revision of the Peace Treaties of St. Germain and Trianon—and with the merits or demerits of the break-up of the Hapsburg Monarchy and the Peace Settlement *per se*, I am not concerned here, as I am not writing a political essay or a diplomatic treatise—in this connection, an erroneous impression has been spread in many Catholic circles in Britain that with the passing of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the position of Catholicism has been weakened in these parts. It has been suggested, moreover, that the political differences of the Slovak People's Party (the Catholic or Clerical National Party of Slovakia) with the Czech administration in Prague, was an earnest of the desire of Catholic Slovakia to withdraw from the Czechoslovak Republic and return to Hungarian rule. Likewise, it has been suggested that the growth of the Croatian autonomous movement and the attitude of the Slovene Clericals in Yugoslavia were signs of the desire of the Croats and Slovenes to dissociate themselves from the Serbs and join again with the Magyars. Both these suggestions are inaccurate, as becomes clear, in a general sense, when one considers that the Clerical leaders both in Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia fought in earlier days for the Czechoslovak and Yugoslav national ideals, whilst, conversely, many Calvinists in Hungary are adherents to the Catholic dynasty of the Hapsburgs. Therefore, while, as I say,

the religious question is indisputably cut across by historical, national and racial considerations, these considerations are not quite so simple as certain political propagandists, desirous of dragging the Church at the chariot wheels of their propaganda, would like us to believe.

Let us first take the situation in Czechoslovakia. A certain Minister of State in Prague, a Bohemian German (and ex-Austrian) after paying a tribute to the growing spirit of collaboration between Czech and Bohemian German, said to me: "The Czech Catholics go to Mass, but they think like Hussites." A joke, but an illuminating one. It explained how to many in that country Catholicism and Protestantism evoked the politico-historic rather than the purely religious image. Thus many Czechs who regard the Hussite religious movement either with indifference or antipathy will yet venerate the memory of John Huss as a figure in the Czech National movement. Conversely, many Czechs with no bias against Catholicism as such, will associate it in their minds with the historic Hapsburg domination of their fatherland.

A very large number of Czechs are, of course, Catholic; and with the consolidation of the Czechoslovak Republic memories of Hapsburgism are beginning to fade, except when revived by political polemics with neighbours. The Catholic Church is very strongly entrenched amongst the Czechs and exercises a considerable influence in cultural and social life. At the same time the Czech People's Party (Catholic) led by Mgr. Srámek (who was himself deputy Prime Minister at one time) has participated in most of the governments formed since the creation of the Republic.

Political clericalism is, however, most strongly entrenched in Slovakia, in the shape of the Slovak People's Party led by Mgr. Hlinka. The Slovak People's Party has had its differences with Prague, and this was especially the case in the early days of the national emancipation during the immediate post-war years, when the over-zealous nationalism on the part of the Czech administration at the centre led to regrettable anti-clerical discrimination in Slovakia. This resulted in the rupture of diplomatic relations between the Holy See and

Prague in July, 1926. But, in the words of Mgr. Kmetko :—

The hopes of those who wished to see those relations permanently broken off, were not realized. The Vatican showed a conciliatory spirit, while our statesmen carefully weighed the issues, and, as there was goodwill on both sides, the lengthy negotiations ended in an agreement (the *Modus Vivendi*) which is quite as valuable as the permanent Concordats concluded with other States.

The objections of the Slovak People's Party to the early mistakes of Prague were purely internal matters and had nothing to do with "separatism," as Father Hlinka himself has frequently pointed out by word and by pen. The Slovak clericals are not separatists. Neither do they desire a return to the old regime. On the contrary, it may be truly said that they have worked for the "Slovakizing" of the Catholic ecclesiastical organization in Slovakia; to emancipate it from what is left over from the Magyar heritage. This "Slovakizing" process is still going on, with the approval of the Holy See, although the Vatican is not prepared to move as rapidly as some of the more ardent Czechoslovak nationalists would perhaps desire. The Vatican never hurries. Unlike the secular diplomacies, it has all eternity to work in.

A picture of the pre-War situation from the Slovak clerical point of view is given by the Rev. Provost Karol Medvecký, who has written :—

Alike for the hierarchy and higher clergy, and also for most of the members of the religious orders, who were ignorant of the Slovak language, and lived in an alien intellectual atmosphere, the Slovak people served merely as useful material from which a powerful Magyar Imperialist State was constructed.

For some time after the War, the Slovak dioceses remained under the jurisdiction of the Hungarian hierarchy, but later were removed from that jurisdiction by the Vatican.

With regard to the general religio-philosophic principles underlying the political activities of the Slovak People's Party, I cannot do better than quote the moving words of Father Hlinka. After explaining that the Church demands the free development of the individual together with the preservation of the supremacy of the Divine and human law: and turning to the specific relation of



Catholicism to the moral qualities of his Slovak flock, Father Hlinka says: "The Catholic religion taught the Slovaks to suffer, to work, and to bear hardships under the old regime . . . fear not those who kill the body, the soul they cannot harm."

In turning to the question of Jugoslavia, it is first necessary to remove any possible misconceptions concerning the relation of Clericalism to internal politics. The autonomous movement in Croatia has nothing to do with Catholicism *per se*, for although Croatia is Catholic the political advocacy of Federalism as against Centralism is not associated with Clericalism. Indeed, Clericalism as a political element is weak in Croatia to-day; and the great Croat leader, the late Stephen Raditch, initiated an anti-clerical feeling amongst his followers, which persists to-day. Where Clericalism, in the political sense, is really strong, where it really "runs" the local provincial life, is in Slovenia, where for years the Slovene Clerical Party led by Father Korochetz has been the main power locally as well as being an important party in the country at large.

Since King Alexander abolished the old parliamentary constitution and set up the Dictatorship (now again in a modified parliamentary form) the old political parties have ceased to exist in the formal sense. Nevertheless—although under the Dictatorship the centralistic idea, the conception of the unitary state, has made itself felt strongly throughout the country—the Slovene clerical organization is still a local entity if no longer formally a national political party.

The Slovene Clericals of Father Korochetz find themselves, it is true, in opposition just now, along with the other one-time political parties, to the present quasi-dictatorial regime. But this is not a "racial" or "religious" matter, as is demonstrated by the fact that the opposition includes elements from amongst Croats, Slovenes and Serbs; Catholics, Orthodox and Moslems. It should not be confused either with "separatism" or with religious principle. It is purely a matter of internal politics *qua* politics. In this connection it is interesting to note that for some time Father Korochetz supported the present regime, but withdrew that support when the then Premier, General Jivkovitch, proposed forming the new

State Party. Father Korochetz felt that he could not be associated with a political organization which included his old political adversary, the socialistic Dr. Kramer. This was one of the reasons, and an important one, for the Clericals joining the opposition.

The activities of Clericalism in Slovenia have been extraordinarily beneficial to the Slovene peasantry. The clergy have set up an admirable system of co-operative agricultural banks and other forms of helpful organization for the people. They have really succeeded in making Slovenia a model province in many ways.

On the other hand the Catholic Church *per se*—as apart from any clericalist political movement—enjoys equal rights with the Serbian Orthodox Church in Yugoslavia, a fact which King Alexander himself has marked by his official presence at the Catholic, no less than at the Orthodox, Cathedral on official occasions. Likewise the spreading out of the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia—even into Orthodox Serbia—is now remarkable, so much so indeed that some of the more ardent supporters of Orthodoxy have noted the fact not without some mis-giving. Indeed, considering the extent to which in the Balkans religion is identified in the popular mind with National entity—Serbia and Bulgarian Orthodoxy being the same in point of dogma, but differing in point of national organization—the Orthodox Serb, who predominates in Yugoslavia, is exceptionally tolerant in religious matters. Orthodox, Jew, Moslem and Catholic all have equal liberty and status within the Yugoslav state.

In this connection many Catholic churches and convents are to be found throughout the country. There are nuns at work even in Belgrade. This could not have happened before the war, when, because of the contiguity of the vast (Catholic) Austro-Hungarian Empire on the very frontier of Belgrade itself, the penetration of Catholic religious orders into Serbia would have been regarded by the Serbs as Austro-Hungarian politico-cultural penetration. To-day, with the realization of the Yugoslav national unity, which means amongst other things the coming together in one state unit of both Catholic and Orthodox South Slavs, such an obstacle to the spread of Catholic activity into Serbia now no longer



exists. It may be said, therefore, that here is an instance of the inaccuracy of the allegation which has been made in some quarters that with the passing of the Hapsburg Monarchy the position of the Catholic Church was weakened in the Danubian regions.

For reasons of internal politics Croats and Slovenes may make some play with their "Catholic" cultural traditions as opposed to the Byzantine-Orthodox culture of the Serbs, but in matters of external policy they are at one with their Serbian cousins. The Yugoslav clericals, whatever their internal political or administrative differences with the Serbs, are not lined up with other clerical parties in other countries in Central and South Eastern Europe. As in the case of the Slovak Clericals in Czechoslovakia, the Yugoslav Clericals are at once devout sons of the Holy See and loyal citizens of their Fatherland.

These reflections lead me to a consideration of Clericalism in that historic centre of the Catholic tradition in Central Europe—the one-time seat of the "Holy Roman Empire"—Austria. The historic background is immense. As one turns the pages of history one sees at times the Church keeping in check the more exaggerated secular ambitions of the Emperors. At other times the policies of Popes and Kaisers were conducted along parallel lines. Yet again there were periods when the two converged upon a common aim, a central idea, an essential line of thought and action. And there was also a time when, in the Empire, and later in the Dual-Monarchy, the clergy—the "Black-Yellow Clericals" as they were called by their adversaries—and the advancing hosts of Liberalism were in conflict.

Something of this controversial politico-historical background is to be found to-day, although, of course, in vastly altered circumstances, for since the War economies have made themselves felt and have influenced political and social life to a degree undreamed of in pre-War days. It was precisely in the politico-economic field in post-War Austria that Clericalism performed its greatest national task; for it was mainly due to the Christian Social Party, and more especially to that party's leader, Mgr. Seipel, that Austria was pulled out of the dreadful financial morass of the years immediately following the War, and virtually saved from destruction. The fact that she is

now drifting back into that morass is due to political and financial causes which are outside the scope of this article.

Mgr. Seipel, the one-time "Priest-Chancellor" of the Austrian Republic, is a remarkable figure. At the moment retired from active politics, and weakened in health by long years of the strain of office, he is no longer on the centre of the political stage. But he still exerts a great influence behind the scenes, and may yet resume an active and leading political rôle. When ruler of Austria, he did not permit his arduous official duties to interfere with his priestly office or alter his modest mode of life. In the days when he ruled at the palace of the Ballplatz, he continued to live in a room at a convent on the outskirts of Vienna, coming up to his work each morning in an "early" tram, along with the workmen.

In the economic-financial field it was Mgr. Seipel who carried through the reconstruction of Austria under the aegis of the League of Nations, because it was he who had succeeded in securing for his country the renewal of the confidence of Europe. I think that admirers and critics alike will admit this. But in the political field he was ever something of an enigma. Friends and enemies have both called him "subtle," and the latter have not hesitated, of course, to apply the term "Jesuit," in their meaning of the word. Diplomatic observers called him "ambiguous." Journalists reported him as "speaking in two voices." Thus to many he has remained a sort of human question-mark.

M. Henri Beraud, the distinguished French writer, in a series of interviews with leading European statesmen, wrote a remarkable "impression" of Mgr. Seipel in which he asked and answered the following question (which I must give in the original French, because, in English we have no words which give exactly the same nuance of meaning at which M. Beraud was aiming): "*Est-ce qu'il est allemand? Non! Est-ce qu'il est germain? Oui!*" This, to my mind, explains the enigma very well. For, Mgr. Seipel really stood for "continuity," adapted to new conditions. The exigencies of day-to-day foreign policy compelled him, at Geneva and elsewhere, to put forward the "official" policy; to invoke the principle of "national self-determination" in favour of Austro-German union (the *Anschluss*). But he invariably qualified these assertions with remarks, not always understood

clearly by his listeners abroad, regarding the necessity of preserving local traditions and culture. In a word: Mgr. Seipel was an "Austrian" Austrian rather than a pan-German Austrian, and in his heart he conceived that Austria's destiny was along lines other than the *Anschluss*. The idea of Austria being absorbed as a mere province in a German Reich dominated by Protestant Prussia does not appeal to him. Hence, his famous slogan: "*Die Interessen Oesterreichs gehen Donau abwärts, und nicht Donau aufwärts*" (The interests of Austria go down the Danube, not up it).

Mgr. Seipel has probably dreamed dreams of some kind of resurrection of the old Monarchy in a new form (perhaps some kind of South-German-cum-Austro-Hungarian-Catholic-Slav orbit) under the crown either of a Wittlesbach or a Hapsburg. But being a practical man no less than a dreamer, he has not pursued this *Fata Morgana* at the expense of everyday realities; and being a priest, he would not plunge his people into the danger of conflict or upheaval in pursuance of such a policy. His emissaries probably have made confidential visits to the ex-Empress Zita and her son, the young Arch-Duke Otto Hapsburg. These subtle threads are not easy to disentangle. But I think that in the world of political and economic reality, Mgr. Seipel would content himself with some kind of Danubian economic confederation in which Vienna could recover in the economic and cultural fields something of what she lost in the political field as a result of the War.

In internal politics, Mgr. Seipel and the Christian-Social Party form the core of the "bourgeoisie bloc." They resist the extremism both of the Socialists and the Fascists. There is a large following of Mgr. Seipel in the Heimwehr, but there is also an extreme element in that organization with which Mgr. Seipel is not on terms. Likewise, with regard to the growing Hitlerist movement in Austria, Mgr. Seipel and his party may be relied upon to resist that too. This, in broad outline, gives some idea, I think, of the position of the Christian-Social (or Clerical) Party in present-day Austria.

Hungary is a somewhat different proposition, because although largely Catholic, she contains a sufficiently big Calvinistic element, too. The two have very similar

politico-social ideas. Hungary has not got a "Catholic" political party in the sense that such parties exist in Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia and Jugoslavia. The Catholic clergy in Hungary may be said, on the whole, to support the Conservatives—the United Party—led by Count Bethlen (himself, like the late Count Tiza, of Calvinistic stock). The Magyar hierarchy is, I should say, predominantly on the Right. This is explained, in the main, by the fact that in Hungary—although there are moderate Liberals and Socialists—politics are more at extreme poles of Right and Left than in other Central European States. Memories of extreme Right and Left regimes are still vivid. The clergy, therefore, gravitate towards the parties of the Magnates and Legitimists, sharing with them an understandable antipathy to anything which in any way suggests the extreme Left.

Being a very nationalistic people—with largely feudal conceptions of the structure of society—responsible Magyar Catholics and Magyar Calvinists alike are to a great extent "restorationists" and "royalists" of one kind or another. They are also, to a great extent, "treaty revisionists" both because of their strong secular nationalism, and because the creation of the Succession States, which reduced the areas of property of the great Magyar land-owners, also reduced the areas of ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the great Magyar prelates.

To sum up : in the foregoing I have endeavoured, apart from the objective reporting of the position of the political clerical parties in these different countries, to keep this consideration of "Clericalism" free from matters of political controversy, and clear of the influences of political propaganda of any kind. For, to endeavour to make use of the Catholic Church—as some misguided, if well-intentioned Catholic lay writers have sometimes so endeavoured—to urge this or that political thesis in international relations, is dangerously akin to giving unto Cæsar the things which should be rendered unto God. The question, for example, of Treaty Revision—pro or anti—is a legitimate one when approached from the secular angle, whether the approach be made by cleric or layman. But it ceases to be legitimate when it is attached, for purely secular or political reasons, to Catholic (*qua* Catholic) interests.

Cleric or layman may regard questions such as this one how he will, according to his National or political orientation, but he should not indulge in political polemics, as such, under the cover of a specifically Catholic ideology. For it should be remembered that while every son of the Church, both amongst the clergy and amongst the faithful, is entitled to his National view-point, and, within certain defined limits, to his party allegiance, the Church herself is above the political battle, as Pope Benedict XV, in the face of hostile comment on the part of many of the faithful in various of the belligerent countries, remembered so well and to his eternal credit during the War.

Holding this view strongly as I do, I would like to conclude on the note that the Catholic Church in Central Europe, as elsewhere, is not limited by frontiers or forms of State organization. In the days of the Hapsburg Monarchy, for instance, the Church worked through the politico-social structure as it existed at the time. Now that the Empire has given place to the Succession States, the Church works through the politico-social structure as it exists in these regions to-day. This is the essence of continuity—the unbroken and unbreakable tradition of the Church.

The Church being eternal—and resting on the unalterable principles of authority and universality—is independent of revolutions and passing constitutional forms. Her mission goes on, working through the new National organisms of to-day as it worked through the old political structures of yesterday, ever gathering unto itself new strength, irrespective of the fall of dynasties or the changes of political frontiers.

## SOME DIFFICULTIES OF THE DAY

### II. ECONOMIC DANGERS TO WORLD-PEACE.

BY THE REV. LEWIS WATT, S.J., B.Sc.(Econ.).

**T**O many well-informed observers the world to-day, fourteen years after the close of the War which was to end war, seems to be far from safe from another conflagration. Whether they are too pessimistic or not, this at least is certain, that everyone should have his eyes open to the factors which are working to produce a war mentality on both sides of the Atlantic and in the East. In the past, of course, dynastic ambitions have been fruitful causes of war, but to-day the majority of dynasties have passed away. The religious wars which came to an end in the seventeenth century are not likely to be paralleled in the twentieth, nor is it necessary nowadays to provide turbulent barons with an outlet for their energy in a foreign campaign. One potent factor of war, however, has been carried over from century to century, and is unhappily as powerful in the modern world as it was in the ancient world and in the middle ages, the factor of national jealousies and national ambitions for domination. Amongst those ambitions is one which has assumed predominance as time has passed, and that is the ambition for economic prosperity at the least, for economic domination if possible. In an economically interdependent world, this is an ambition which tries to realize itself especially by means of international trade. It is in this sphere that lurk some of the gravest dangers to the peace of the modern world, all the graver because they so easily pass unperceived until it is too late to counteract them.

It is obvious that international trade does not of its nature make for war, any more than does trade between the nationals of any one particular country. Ideally, international trade should not only bring economic advantage to the trading nations, but should even help towards international peace, by making the prosperity of each of the trading nations a matter of satisfaction to all the others. He would be thought a strange and short-



sighted tradesman who deplored the prosperity of his customers, and welcomed any disaster which threatened them with bankruptcy. Yet experience has proved that the economic interdependence of nations is no effective barrier against war. Without accepting the theory that fundamentally every war is merely the outcome or the expression of economic conflict, it is easy to see that international trade may make for war as much as, ideally, it should make for peace. It may seem short-sighted and foolish for a tradesman to deplore the prosperity of his customers; but what if his customers are also his competitors? what if he thinks he would gain more by their being put out of business (and so out of competition with him) than he would lose by the cessation of their custom?

Such a situation is far more usual in international trade than in trade between the citizens of the same country, because the diversity of goods passing between one country and another is greater than between two traders of the same nation. Britain may be a formidable competitor of the United States in the motor industry, while being one of her best customers for wheat or tobacco. Italy takes a great deal of our coal, but that does not prevent her being a vigorous competitor of ours in the markets for artificial silk and cotton goods. The danger to peace lies in the competition between nations for markets and for sources of supply of raw materials, for this competition leads to what has been aptly called "economic imperialism." This is the policy which has been pursued by the industrialized nations for at least the last half-century, and consists in an attempt to secure control of the undeveloped territories of the world, with a view to obtaining raw materials from them or to developing them as markets for capital goods, such as the materials for the construction of railways, bridges and roads. Needless to say, this policy logically and in fact leads to an endeavour to hold what has been gained against all comers. The history of Africa, Asia and South America supplies abundant examples of economic imperialism, to say nothing of the policy of the United States in the Caribbean. The still unsettled Sino-Japanese conflict flared up on account of Japan's determination to strengthen her position in Manchuria, and to break the Chinese boycott of Japanese goods.

"Thinking of the Unthinkable" is the description

given by Mr. Ludwell Denny in a remarkable book<sup>1</sup> to his discussion of the possibility of war between the United States and Great Britain. With an extraordinary wealth of documented detail he describes the current economic rivalry between these great nations, whose friendship is the keystone of world-peace. Both countries attach enormous importance to the markets of Latin America and the Far East, and it is there (though not only there) that they are at grips with one another in a conflict which, in Mr. Denny's opinion, will inevitably precipitate war.

The attitude of Latin America is, as is well known, far from friendly to the United States. The republics of the South fear the economic imperialism of the "Colossus of the North," which is not surprising in view of the fact that, as a result of loans from the United States, more than half of the Latin American republics have to submit to some kind of control exercised from Washington. This control is resented not only by the people over whom it is exercised, but by the commercial rivals of the controlling power. Another source of ill-feeling towards the United States in South America is her high tariff wall. Whatever views one may hold in the old debate "*Protection versus Free Trade*," it is clear to all that tariffs always tend to foster international friction. It is largely for this reason that most British Protectionists are quite ready to admit that a world-wide system of free trade is highly desirable, protection being a second-best policy forced upon us by the tariff policies of other countries. In 1927 the World Economic Conference resolved that the general tendency to increase tariff barriers should cease, and indeed be reversed. How little effect that resolution has had is a matter of common knowledge. Every nation seems more and more determined to exclude, so far as possible, imports from other nations, and to reduce international trade to a mere trickle. Bad as this is from an economic point of view, it is even worse from the standpoint of those who desire world-peace. For tariff barriers are the hall-mark of economic nationalism, and the spirit of nationalism always tends to be bellicose. Moreover, tariffs in one country lead to retaliatory tariffs in others, thus increasing international friction and ill-feeling. They foster dumping, with all the uneasiness and resentment which dumping produces in its victim.

<sup>1</sup> *America Conquers Britain* (Knopf, 1930).



Closely connected with this question of tariffs is the problem of the "quota" system, a comparatively recent method of producing international friction on a large scale. Instead of foreign imports being merely taxed, they are absolutely prohibited beyond a certain percentage or quota. Great Britain has been hard hit in the last few months by this system, and Mr. Hore-Belisha (Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade) referred to the matter in the House of Commons on March 23rd last as follows:

This quota method has put a new complexion on the commercial relations of all trading peoples. It is a feature that has come into great prominence lately. France not only restricts coal imports from this country into her own domain, but she restricts the importation of certain manufactured articles. This system has been followed by other countries, and is becoming a very serious factor to other exporting nations. In France this system dates from last August. Latvia and Esthonia are also operating this system; the Netherlands have recently applied it to certain goods; Switzerland has applied it to a large number of articles, and Czechoslovakia and various other countries have followed suit.

He had previously referred to the application of the quota system by Germany and Belgium, and he went on to say, amid cheers, that it is a system to which we must adjust ourselves, though he did not explain what form the adjustment was to take. Finally he added:

There used to be a doctrine that imports pay for exports. It has an almost universal validity, but where the quota exists the doctrine is falsified at once. The exporting nation is under a complete disability; no matter how cheaply she wishes to sell, she cannot find a purchaser for her goods in excess of the quota. It is no good trying to operate a commercial system in accordance with a theory which no longer exists.

Omitting any discussion of Mr. Hore-Belisha's economics, attention should be paid to the exasperated tone. That the quota system does operate to exacerbate relations between nations is amply proved by the protests which British coalowners and the British Chamber of Commerce in Paris have made, and the official representations which have been made to the Governments imposing quotas.

Closely connected with the question of economic imperialism (or the struggle for raw materials and

markets) and economic nationalism manifested by prohibitive tariff barriers, is the problem of foreign loans and foreign investment. To take the latter first, it is important for our purpose to consider the effect on world-peace of the acquisition by investors in one country of industries in another country. Writing in *The Economic Journal* (June, 1930), Sir Robert Kindersley said: "The growing encroachment of American interests in British industry, commerce and finance is giving rise to a problem which needs the more to be stressed since there is this prevailing ignorance of the dimensions it has reached." He draws attention to the fact that the American International Telegraph and Telephone Company controls various British companies trading in South America; and that the Electric Bond and Share Company of America has acquired control of British concerns in Mexico, Chile and Argentina, and a fifty per cent. interest in Tata and Sons, Ltd., a firm which controls electric power in Bombay. The Macmillan Committee has recently urged investors to put their money into British-owned enterprises abroad rather than into foreign Government and municipal loans, lest our foreign competitors "develop one 'tied' enterprise after another, or purchase from us enterprises previously 'tied' to us" (No. 384). The Balfour Committee sounded the same note. We had an example of the friction and international hostility which can be produced by the resistance of an industry to its domination by foreign capital three years ago, when the British General Electric Company, under the leadership of Sir Hugo Hirst, endeavoured to deprive foreign stockholders of their voting rights in the company, and American stockholders sent representatives to protest, with the support of their Government. The invasion of American capital is looked on with some alarm in this country, at any rate when there is question of the control of important key industries. That only three per cent. of the share capital of the British Ford Motor Company is now held in Great Britain has been recently treated as a matter for self-congratulation by the Press here, but that is because the investment does not happen to be regarded as particularly promising at present. If there were any danger of Imperial Chemical Industries, for instance, passing under foreign control (which there is not), there would be a national outcry about a national danger. The threat to international peace contained in the penetration

of important home industries by foreign investors is evident.

The danger latent in loans to foreign Governments and municipalities is perhaps not so evident at first sight, yet it is indubitably there. There is first of all the danger that the loan, whatever its ostensible purpose, may be used to finance war. Sir Arthur Salter, in his recent book *Recovery*, has dwelt on the risk of lending to Governments likely to undertake rash adventures against their neighbours, and has illustrated the danger by the history of the Bolivia-Paraguay affair in 1928. In that case Bolivia obtained a loan of twenty-three million dollars from New York for refunding, for railway construction and for "other purposes." In spite of the fact that it became known that Bolivia had spent the loan on armaments, a further loan was obtained from the same issuing house, and Bolivia was on the point of war with Paraguay when the United States intervened and forced her to submit the dispute to the Pan-American Conference. Speaking from a very wide and international experience, Sir Arthur Salter says: "When a large loan is being negotiated from a big country to a small one, political dangers are practically always involved," and the chief of political dangers is the danger of war. This is not to say that the loan will normally be used to prepare for war, as in the case of Bolivia, but it reminds us that such loans do lead to economic imperialism on account of the political or fiscal control which ordinarily accompanies them for the security of the investors. This arouses the jealousy and suspicions of other nations as imperialistic ambitions always do, and an atmosphere is created far more favourable to war than to peace.

Economically speaking, these foreign loans appear on the whole to injure rather than benefit the investors. Sir A. M. Samuel maintains that default on the part of foreign borrowers is so common that on the whole we have lost far more than we have gained by our past policy of foreign investment (he estimates that British investors have lost £2,000,000,000 overseas in the last sixty years), and Sir Arthur Salter holds that the wasteful expenditure by public authorities of funds obtained from foreign loans "is very great indeed and will remain a cancer in the whole of the world's financial and political system until it is dealt with." And yet we have the spectacle of lenders

competing with one another in the effort to persuade foreign countries to borrow from them! But we are not here concerned with the economic pros and cons of foreign lending.<sup>2</sup> For our present purpose, it is enough to point out that default may lead to war, owing to the bondholders persuading their Government to use armed force against the defaulting country.

A subtle and hardly recognized danger to international peace is bound up with widespread misunderstandings about the balance of trade. The idea that a surplus of exports over imports is an index to the prosperity of a country has obtained general currency, and it has been fostered by unfortunate and misleading economic terminology. For a century and a half prior to Adam Smith, the economic theory known as Mercantilism held the field. That theory laid great stress on the advantages of accumulating in a country a treasure of the precious metals (gold and silver), and this led them to look with great favour upon a surplus of exports of merchandise over imports of the same; for, in their day, the surplus was normally paid for in bullion. They, therefore, called such an export surplus a "favourable" balance of trade. On this point at least Mercantilism has long been abandoned, but its terminology of "favourable" for an export-surplus and "adverse" for an import-surplus has unfortunately been retained. Dr. Edwin Cannan, in his Sydney Ball lecture last November,<sup>3</sup> suggested that the bias which still persists in favour of exports and against imports is due to the fact that the man in the street believes that our exports discharge our monetary obligations abroad, whereas imports increase those obligations, at any rate when imports exceed exports.

Probably the man in the street thinks of international trade as he thinks about trade between individuals of the same country. For him, what a country exports corresponds to the goods which a tradesman sells, and what it imports corresponds to what a tradesman buys.

<sup>2</sup> As a set-off to the recommendations of the Balfour and Macmillan Committees in favour of foreign investment, one should consult a striking though "unorthodox" book by F. E. Holsinger, *The Mystery of the Trade Depression* (P. S. King, 1929).

<sup>3</sup> Published by the Oxford Press, *Balance of Trade Delusions*.

If the value of what a tradesman sells in a year is greater than the value of what he has bought, he has made a profit. To the man in the street, therefore, it appears obvious that an export-surplus is most desirable, and an import-surplus alarming. This attitude of mind is not changed by pointing out to the man in the street that other items besides merchandise and bullion enter into the balance of indebtedness between countries; that he must take account also of the services ("invisible exports") which one country renders to another, and for which it may be paid in visible imports. If there is still an import-surplus, he will feel dissatisfied.

Yet there is one very important item which he is overlooking, and which entirely changes the economic aspect of the question, and that is the matter of foreign investment referred to above in another context. Foreign loans are made by the lending country exporting merchandise (and occasionally bullion) to the borrowing country; and the interest on such loans, in so far as it is paid and not merely re-invested in the borrowing country, is discharged by the export of merchandise or/and bullion by the borrowing country to the lending country. *Ceteris paribus*, therefore, the exports of a creditor country will increase while it is making a foreign loan, and the imports of the debtor country will similarly increase; when interest payments are being made by the debtor country to the creditor country, the exports of the former will (*ceteris paribus*) increase, as will also the imports of the latter.

From this it follows that a surplus of exports over imports is no infallible sign of prosperity in the exporting country. It may merely mean that its citizens are investing abroad; and this may be because industry in their own country is depressed and cannot pay them as much for their money as foreign borrowers can. Or, again, it may mean that foreign borrowers are defaulting on their payments of interest, so that imports into the creditor country have decreased. Or it may mean that the creditor country is simply re-investing abroad the interest due to it. There are other possibilities which it is not necessary to enumerate. The point is that an export-surplus is not essential to the prosperity of a country.



To illustrate this by an example. The foreign investments of Great Britain are authoritatively estimated at about £4,000,000,000, and the interest due to us on this is estimated at well over £200,000,000. If we take the figures supplied by the Board of Trade (whatever their defects, the best we have), we find that we have an import-surplus of merchandise and bullion each year of over £300,000,000. A large part of this surplus is paid for by our "invisible exports" (services rendered by our mercantile marine, our banks and financial houses, etc.); but there still remains a large import-surplus representing the interest we actually receive on our foreign loans, which is evidence of the foreign wealth of this country. Similarly, the United States, since the War, has had a large surplus due to her from foreign debtors, and her refusal (by means of a high tariff) to accept merchandise in payment has been the main cause of the enormous flow of gold to her coffers.

To pursue this topic further would lead us outside the scope of an article on world-peace. It has been discussed at some length to emphasize the point that a surplus of exports is not essential to the prosperity of such creditor countries as Great Britain and the United States. Indeed, Sir Arthur Salter (*Recovery*, p. 54) urges creditor countries to import more and export less, in the interests of world recovery. The application of this to the problem of world-peace is not difficult to make. So long as great creditor nations are persuaded that their vital economic interests demand an export-surplus, not merely are they competitors in the field of international finance and trade, but their competition tends to assume the aspect of a life-and-death struggle for economic survival with the whole weight of national sentiment behind it. There is no need to emphasize the danger of such an attitude passing into a war mentality. The claim to "a place in the sun" has already served to provoke one terrible war, for, however reasonable the claim may be in itself, it is easily interpreted to mean that everyone else should be in the shadow. In other words, the desire of creditor nations for an export-surplus (*i.e.*, for a steady flow of investments into other countries) inevitably produces economic imperialism with all its dangers to the peace of the world. The dangers to peace latent in the struggle for the control of markets and

especially of the sources of supply of food-stuffs and raw materials are serious enough in themselves, without their being increased by what Dr. Cannan has called "balance of trade delusions."

Turning now to an entirely different topic, something must be said about the economic dangers to peace which arise from the existence of the industry of armaments. It is unfortunately undeniable that the interests of this industry are unfavourable to peace, for a war means increased business and much larger profits to it. In connection with the Sino-Japanese conflict, the German Press has given the names of ships, with dates of sailing, carrying large freights of explosives, bombs, machine-guns, aeroplane parts and revolvers from the harbours of the Elbe to Japan. The German chemical industry has sent thither huge quantities of acid for making explosives, and in one instance 2,600 crates of chemicals were declared as "pianos." In France, the Schneider works at Creusot received a contract for twenty heavy tanks, and the French automobile factory at Dijon an order for 4,000 aeroplane bombs for Japan. The French Schneider Creusot works control the Skoda factories in Czechoslovakia, which have been busy producing bombs for Japan to be shipped via Trieste, and via Hamburg have shipped seven hundred boxes of amunitions to the same destination. From Japan, too, firms in Upper Silesia have received orders amounting to three million dollars. The munitions of war sent to Japan from the United States are estimated at a value of 180 million dollars, and from Great Britain in the two months December, 1931, and January, 1932, over £41,000 worth of munitions were sent to the same country.<sup>4</sup> A war makes business brisk for those who deal in the sinews of war, and it must be remembered that the business may work in curious ways to secure all the profit it can. Admiral Consett estimated that the Great War was prolonged two years by the contraband of war which was shipped from England to Germany via Scandinavia and Holland. The French are alleged to have delivered to Germany during the War whole trains of sulphuretted hydrogen via Switzerland; and the Germans to have sent thousands of tons of iron by the same route into France,

<sup>4</sup> *New Statesman*, March 26th, 1932.

Italy and Russia.<sup>5</sup> A writer in a Catholic monthly of Belgium, *La Terre Wallonne*, for February last, states: "A well-known foreigner has related to us the following fact, on his word of honour. During the War, at the moment of the horrible carnage of Verdun, he saw at the same table the proprietors of German, French and English armament firms eating, and drinking champagne. This took place in an hotel in Switzerland." The writer adds that he can give the names of these men and of the hotel.

This article does not profess to have exhausted all the economic factors which are, consciously or unconsciously, provocative of war; indeed, to do so would be almost impossible. A word must be said in conclusion about a problem which is indirectly economic, the population problem. The laws which restrict or prohibit the immigration of foreigners are becoming more numerous every year, and they certainly do not make for international good feeling. The problem of restricting immigration is undoubtedly a difficult one. On the one hand there are nations with an overflowing and increasing population, such as Italy and especially Japan. On the other, there are nations who consider that their standard of living is threatened by immigrants who are content to work for wages far lower than could satisfy the native-born; or who fear that their national culture and institutions will be swamped by a flood of immigrants from countries having (in the opinion of the critics) a lower cultural level. So far this problem has not troubled us in England to anything like the extent that it has perturbed the United States and some of the Dominions, but it may do so in the future in view of the large amount of unemployment here and of the fact that the tide of emigration is turning towards our shores. Last year for the first time (excluding the years of the War) the number of immigrants of British nationality arriving here from non-European countries exceeded the number of British emigrants for those countries; and that by over 35,000. It seems that if this tendency continues we shall inevitably be confronted with demands for the exclusion from Great Britain of at least non-European nationals who would like to settle here. How would legislation to enforce this

<sup>5</sup> Otto Lehmann-Russbuldt, *L'Internationale des Armements* (1930).



affect our relations with the Dominions and with the United States?

Economic imperialism, economic nationalism (both of them aided and abetted by popular delusions about the balance of trade), the commerce in armaments, the restriction of immigration, these are the main economic factors making for international friction, resentment and war in the modern world. The issues they raise cannot be ignored by those who would like to relegate war to the limbo of old, forgotten, far-off things, and who are working for the peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ.

## AUXILIARY BISHOPS IN ENGLAND BEFORE THE REFORMATION

BY THE REV. WALTER GUMBLEY, O.P., F.R.Hist.S.

THE names of more than two hundred auxiliary or suffragan<sup>1</sup> bishops, who worked in England before Elizabeth finally broke with Holy See in 1559, can be gleaned from records already published. The majority of these names are to be found in the *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum* of Bishop Stubbs, re-edited by E. E. Holmes (Clarendon Press) in 1897, and the *Hierarchia Catholica Medii Ævi* published by C. Eubel in three volumes at Ratisbon in 1913, but many others are gathered from the historical records of the religious orders who furnished the greater number of auxiliary bishops, and from Episcopal Registers published since the *Registrum* of Stubbs.

Although both Saxon and Norman diocesans occasionally employed auxiliary bishops the custom did not become common until the thirteenth century, and not widespread until the fourteenth. After that time the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Bishops of London, Winchester, Lincoln, Exeter, Salisbury, and Worcester seem rarely to have been without an assistant. The bishops of Bath and Wells, Hereford, Lichfield, and Norwich employed auxiliaries very frequently; those of Ely, Durham, Chichester, and Carlisle seldom; Rochester not at all. The Welsh dioceses, with the exception of St. David's, were not considered sufficiently good benefices for great ministers of State, and as absence on government work was one of the principal reasons for the employment of an auxiliary it is not surprising that few Welsh bishops employed them. It would, however, be far from just to accuse all the political bishops of continued absence from, and neglect of, their dioceses—that accusation can only be levelled against those who

<sup>1</sup> The term *suffragan* strictly used denotes a *diocesan* bishop in relation to his *metropolitan*, but in the Middle Ages it was commonly applied to an *auxiliary* bishop. To avoid confusion the latter term has been used throughout this paper.

served under the Yorkist and Tudor kings. Men such as Wykeham of Winchester and Gilbert of Hereford, Chancellor and Treasurer of England respectively under Edward III and Richard II, did the greater part of their diocesan work without assistance. It was not till Wykeham became old that he had a regular auxiliary, and Gilbert dispensed with one during most of his time at Hereford and does not seem to have employed one at all when he was translated to St. David's. Contrast these two Plantagenet bishops with Foxe and Wolsey under the Tudors. Foxe, who was by turns Bishop of Exeter, and Bath and Wells, never set foot in the cathedral church of either see, and only saw Durham, his next diocese, because he had to do business between Henry VII and James IV of Scotland. Wolsey died as all the world knows just when arranging his formal entry into York as Archbishop, although he had already held the see sixteen years. Under Henry VIII Bath and Wells, Salisbury, and Worcester, were held by Italian prelates resident in Rome; Worcester, in fact, did not have a resident diocesan for thirty-eight years, 1497-1535, and then it got a first-class heretic Hugh Latimer. One of its absentee bishops was Cardinal Giulio de Medicis after Pope Clement VII.<sup>2</sup>

The principal class from which English bishops chose their helpers were the bishops whose sees were in *partibus infidelium*. These *partes infidelium* were almost identical with the lands formerly Christian, but since fallen under the power of the Moslems. But before we go further it is necessary to point out that it was not until late in the fifteenth century that an auxiliary became attached to one diocese; till that time he wandered from diocese to diocese seeking employment. Perhaps this may be explained by a constant hope on the part of the Popes that the *partes infidelium* might be wrested back from the Turks, and the titular could then return to his see. Some proof of this can be seen in the case of four English Dominicans: William Fresney, Archbishop of Rages; William, Bishop of Antarada; Geoffrey, Bishop of Hebron; and William, Bishop of Lydda—all of whom had worked in the Holy Land between 1250 and 1300. Of these Fresney certainly

<sup>2</sup> See *The Italian Bishops of Worcester*, by Bishop Creighton, in *Historical Essays and Reviews*. London, 1902.

remained in England during the whole of his episcopal life (1263-128'), acting frequently for the Bishop of Norwich, but found occasionally at Salisbury, and dying presumably in the diocese of St. Asaph whose bishop at the time was Anian de Nanneu, a fellow Dominican. But Fresney was not a mere auxiliary, drawing a salary from a diocesan, he was the personal friend and pensioner of Henry III and Edward I, and mixed much in political events, including the rebellion of Simon de Montfort.<sup>3</sup>

Another Archbishop with an Eastern title was Hugh, Archbishop of Damascus, a Hermit of St. Augustine, who acted as auxiliary to the Archbishop of York between 1344 and 1351. He got into trouble for exercising episcopal functions in the diocese of Exeter without permission in 1347 for which the bishop of that see cited him to appear before the Archbishop of Canterbury. There was also trouble about a horse which he accused the Byland Cistercians of stealing.<sup>4</sup> Archbishop Hugh was not the only offender against the rights of diocesans, for we find Bishop Ralph of Bath fifteen years later (1362) declaring John Lanbury, Bishop of Biduana, to be his auxiliary, owing to the number of unauthorized bishops acting as auxiliaries up and down the country.<sup>5</sup> Perhaps Bishop Ralph even suspected the episcopal character of these peripatetic prelates. That such a suspicion would not have been unreasonable is evident from a scandalous affair in the diocese of Lichfield about a dozen years later. Bishop Stretton had commissioned a certain William, *Episcopus Bellenensis*, to ordain a considerable number of candidates at Colwich in Staffordshire, hard by the episcopal residence at Shugborough, on the 16th of September, 1375, and again on the 26th. It was afterwards discovered that this man's episcopal character was so doubtful that all the candidates had to return to Colwich in the following May to be re-ordained by Robert Worksop, *Episcopus Prissinensis*.<sup>6</sup> Some carelessness may be attributed to Stretton in this matter, but otherwise during his long episcopate (1360-

<sup>3</sup> For an account of this prelate see the *Flintshire Historical Society Journal*, 1915, pp. 36-41.

<sup>4</sup> Stubbs, 196.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 197.

<sup>6</sup> *Register of Robert Stretton*, Salt Society Collections, Vol. VIII, 307, 326.

1386) he seems to have chosen his auxiliaries well. He employed them so constantly that had we not the evidence of his own Register to prove that he himself often officiated at ordinations we might have been inclined to believe the statement made against him by De Lisle, the contemporary Bishop of Ely, that he could not read, either from blindness or ignorance. Of William Bellenensis we hear no more. As late as the sixteenth century there was trouble with the titulars and in 1510 we find Bishop FitzJames of London turning out of his diocese Thomas Wolf, Bishop of Lacedaemon, who went on to Bath and Wells whose bishop was the absentee Cardinal di Castello. Wolf however seems to have made his peace with FitzJames for he is mentioned as Vicar of East Ham in 1514.<sup>7</sup> In 1511, the year following Wolf's ejection from the diocese, trouble arose because Thaddaeus Irril, Bishop of Dromore, presumably acting as auxiliary for FitzJames, conferred Holy Orders when under sentence of excommunication.<sup>8</sup>

The employment of Irish bishops as auxiliaries in England dated from the thirteenth century and continued until the Reformation. As early as 1245 John, Bishop of Ardfert, is mentioned by Stubbs as helping the Archbishop of Canterbury,<sup>9</sup> and in 1261 William de Hay, an Austin Canon, Bishop of Connor, was in the Lincoln diocese where, on January 23rd, he granted an indulgence of twenty days to all who should pray for the soul of Richard Sumerton, an Austin Canon of Canons Ashby.<sup>10</sup> Stubbs gives the names of more than sixty holders of Irish sees acting as auxiliaries in England, and several more can be added to his list. These were for the most part Englishmen appointed through the influence of the English Government, but not a few were Irishmen pressed by the poverty of their sees to seek a living elsewhere—the poverty caused by the insatiable rapacity of the Crown officials. Within the Pale it was comparatively easy for an English bishop to keep residence, but not so easy for those appointed to sees beyond English control; thus Richard, Bishop of Kildare (Inniscattery), was licensed on June 23rd, 1414,

<sup>7</sup> Stubbs, 201.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 206.

<sup>9</sup> Stubbs, 207.

<sup>10</sup> Original Deed at Hawkesyard Priory, Staffs.

by Pope John XXIII to remain and hold a benefice in England "because he a Friar Preacher and an Englishman cannot reside in Ireland which is in a state of rebellion."<sup>11</sup>

Not all the bishops named by Stubbs acted permanently in England; some of them were only temporary auxiliaries or perhaps on journeys. Cabric O'Scoba of Raphoe, who is put down as auxiliary to Canterbury in 1273, was most probably on his way to the General Council of Lyons; and considering that the Archbishop Robert Kilwardby was, like O'Scoba, a Dominican it seems likely that they may have arranged to go together. O'Scoba died during the Council, and according to his contemporaries in the odour of sanctity.<sup>12</sup> Ralph Kelly, a Carmelite and Bishop of Leighlin, is described as auxiliary to York in 1344, and to Winchester in 1346 in which year he was translated to Cashel, where undoubtedly he spent the rest of his life.<sup>13</sup> William Andrews, a Friar Preacher of Guildford, appointed Bishop of Achonry in 1373, spent his time at the Papal Court where he was Master of the Sacred Palace. He was transferred to Meath in 1380 and is stated to have acted as auxiliary to Canterbury the same year. How long he acted as such it is not easy to say, perhaps he only helped on his way to Ireland, breaking his journey for some time. We know he held a synod at Drogheda in 1385 to condemn the teachings of the Carmelite, Henry Crompe, suspected of being a follower of Wyclif.<sup>14</sup> John Goes, or Geese, an English Carmelite and Bishop of Waterford (1409-1425), spent most of his time in Ireland until after 1420 when he returned to England to act as the Bishop of London's auxiliary. It seems he had made Ireland too hot for him by his outrageous conduct towards Archbishop O'Hedian of Cashel.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Bliss, *Calendar of Papal Registers relating to England*, VI, 513.

<sup>12</sup> MacInerny, *History of the Irish Dominicans*. Browne & Nolan, Dublin, 1916. p. 292.

<sup>13</sup> McCaffrey, *The White Friars*. Gill, Dublin, 1926. pp. 353 foll.

<sup>14</sup> Stubbs, 204; Taurisano, *Hierarchia Ord. Praed.*, Rome, 1916, p. 22; *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, Rolls, 343, 351.

<sup>15</sup> McCaffrey, *Ibid.*



A number of these auxiliaries from Ireland were bishops who had resigned their sees, and of these the first in dignity were three Archbishops of Armagh: Walter Jorz or Joyce, Roland his brother, and Edmund Conisburgh. Walter Jorz was driven to resign in 1311 by the intolerable exactions of the English officials and retired to the diocese of Lincoln where he is styled coadjutor bishop in September, 1320.<sup>16</sup> The debts that Walter Jorz contracted to pay the English Crown were left as a crushing burden to his brother Roland who followed him. Because the latter did not pay the papal dues he was excommunicated by the Papal officials, and then cited to appear before the Bishops of Meath and Connor to answer for his contumacy. So far had poverty driven him that if his accusers can be believed he had leased part of his cathedral as a warehouse. He was forced to resign in 1321 and found peace as auxiliary first to Canterbury and then to York, where he was still working in 1333.<sup>17</sup> Conisburgh, a century and a half later, found his lot at Armagh equally unbearable, so he resigned in 1477 after holding the Primacy but one year, and went to help at Ely.<sup>18</sup>

Yet another class of auxiliaries were Englishmen appointed to Irish sees on a false rumour of the incumbents' death, and if consecrated before the error was discovered they had to look for employment from the English diocesans. Thus Henry Nony, Prior of the Dominicans at Exeter, was appointed to Ardagh in error in 1392 and consecrated. His own diocesan Thomas Brantingham found him work.<sup>19</sup> Richard Wolsey, in like manner, was appointed to Down and Connor and received consecration in 1451, but as the see was not vacant he acted for the bishops of Lichfield and Worcester until 1479.<sup>20</sup> So widespread in fact was the practice of employing Irish bishops as auxiliaries in England as to warrant the conclusion that Irish sees were almost regarded as bishoprics *in partibus*.

<sup>16</sup> MacInerny, *Irish Dominicans*, pp. 507-603; Bliss, *Cal. of Papal Registers*, II, 200.

<sup>17</sup> Stuart's *Historical Memoirs of Armagh*. Ed. Coleman. 105, 116; Stubbs, 204.

<sup>18</sup> Brady, *Episcopal Succession*, I, 215; Stubbs, 204.

<sup>19</sup> Bliss, V, 331; Stubbs, 205.

<sup>20</sup> *Bullarium Ord. Praed.*, III, 333; Stubbs, 206.

An attempt to place Englishmen in Scottish dioceses was not nearly so successful, for whereas a number of Englishmen did actually reside in their Irish sees, not one was able to get into Scotland, although several were nominated. John Eggescliffe, an English Dominican, was provided to the see of Glasgow in 1318 by Pope John XXII, at the request of Edward II of England, but as it was four years after Bannockburn he had to stay in England helping the Archbishop of York until he got the see of Connor in 1322, and finally Llandaff where he ruled in peace from 1323 to 1347.<sup>21</sup> Pope John XXII, a year or two later, refused to repeat the experiment when Edward II asked that another Dominican, John of Pontefract, should get Dunblane.<sup>22</sup> But during the great Schism of the West, when Scotland obeyed the anti-Popes at Avignon, the Roman Pontiffs took the occasion of nominating a number of Englishmen to Scottish bishoprics. Robert Derling, Nicholas Duffield, and William Gunwardby held in succession the see of Dunkeld between 1379 and 1457, but all three remained in England as auxiliaries, as also did a certain John, appointed to Glasgow in 1393, and Simon nominated to Argyll about 1385.<sup>23</sup> The Bishops of Whithern or Candida Casa often helped the Archbishops of York to which see Whithern was for many years suffragan. The Bishops of Man and the Southern Isles of Scotland, called more commonly the Bishops of Sodor, were ecclesiastically subject to the Norwegian Archbishop of Nidaros (the modern Trondjhem), but had little to do with him after the fourteenth century, and owing to the smallness of their revenues often came to England for employment. We find John Duncan at London in 1391, and John Green, appointed sometime before 1449, spent the whole of his episcopal life in England.<sup>24</sup>

During the Schism the Popes of the Roman Obedience even nominated Englishmen to French bishoprics, but the nominees remained titulars in fact, and helped their English brethren. About 1382 Urban VI provided to the see of Nantes a Cambridge Dominican, William

<sup>21</sup> *Letters from the Northern Registers*, Rolls Series, 299, 300.

<sup>22</sup> Historical MSS. Commission IV Report, 385.

<sup>23</sup> Eubel, I, 232 and n. 11; Stubbs, 197.

<sup>24</sup> Stubbs, 213.



Bottisham, or Bottlesham. This bishop was a noted man in his day and was a member of the Council of the Earthquake which assembled in 1382 to condemn the teachings of Wyclif. He had been Provincial of his Order in England and Master of the Sacred Palace to Urban VI, and he stood by the side of that irascible Pontiff when he was besieged in Nocera in 1385 by the Queen of Naples and the Abbot of Monte Cassino. It was expressly on account of his fidelity on this occasion that Urban gave him the See of Rochester in 1389; probably he was one of those who accompanied the Pope to the walls when the indomitable old man each day excommunicated with bell, book, and candle Queen, Abbot and army.<sup>25</sup> Between 1382 and 1384 Bottisham had acted as auxiliary to Bishop Braybrook of London, but on his departure for Italy William, Bishop of Tournay, succeeded him as auxiliary and was still acting as such as late as 1406. In 1401 he assisted Guy de Mohun, Bishop of S. David's, at the consecration of Ralph Appleby, Bishop of Ossory, the other assistant being Thomas, Bishop of Coutances, another English titular of a French diocese.<sup>26</sup>

Ireland, Scotland, France and the East did not exhaust the possibilities; even Iceland, the Faroe Isles, and Greenland were called upon to supply titular sees for Englishmen. As early as 1050 Ralph, a cousin of St. Edward the Confessor, having been Bishop of Skalholt in Iceland returned to his monastery of Abingdon and became Abbot there and probably acted as auxiliary to Canterbury. His predecessor as Abbot was Siward, who also had been bishop somewhere in Scandinavia and likewise auxiliary to Canterbury.<sup>27</sup> John Williams, who had been Bishop first of Holar, in the north of Iceland, in 1426, was translated to Skalholt, the southern diocese, in 1435, but was acting in 1436 as auxiliary to the Bishop of Bath and Wells. There is evidence that he had visited Holar and ordained there, but his successor in that see, John of Bloxwich, a Carmelite, found it too distant and sent John May, captain of the ship *Catherine of London*, to find out,

<sup>25</sup> National Biog. s.v. Bottisham; Quétif, *Scriptores Ord. Praed.*, I, 259. He places him a century too early.

<sup>26</sup> Stubbs, 197, 198.

<sup>27</sup> Stubbs, 195; *Chronicles of Abbey of Abingdon*, Rolls Series.

and make a report on, the state of his diocese. Surely a visitation unique in ecclesiastical annals. Bloxwich remained in England, in turn becoming auxiliary to Canterbury and Exeter. Stubbs has confused him with his predecessor.<sup>28</sup> William Northburg or Norbury, a Dominican, was nominated to the see of the Faroe Isles about 1385, but though he did not brave the Arctic seas his predecessors had done so and the ruined cathedral at Kirkebo testifies to a civilization passed away. William, who from his name would seem to have been a Staffordshire man, preferred to act as auxiliary at Lichfield until in 1390 he moved on to York where his commission as auxiliary was renewed in 1408.<sup>29</sup> Still further north was the see of Gardar on the west coast of Greenland, which had resident bishops from the eleventh to the end of the fourteenth century, but by the time John Ringman, an English Franciscan, was appointed in 1425 the Christian colony once flourishing had almost ceased to exist. Ringman was auxiliary at Norwich from 1426 to 1446.<sup>30</sup>

Two retired English diocesans figure amongst the auxiliary bishops. The first was Thomas Merks, Bishop of Carlisle, deposed from his see by the usurper Henry IV and translated to the titular see of Samosata by Pope Boniface IX in 1400. Though his bold speech is not historically true, his loyalty to the fallen Richard II was the cause of his deprivation. Shakespeare, who has immortalized him in his *Richard II*, makes Henry IV bid the bishop

Choose out some secret place, some reverend room,  
More than thou hast, and with it joy thy life;  
So as thou livest in peace, die free from strife:  
For though mine enemy thou hast ever been,  
High sparks of honour in thee have I seen.

"Some reverend room" was given him by the great Bishop of Winchester, William of Wykeham, who provided him with the Rectory of Todenham and made him his auxiliary, an office in which he was continued by Bishop (afterwards Cardinal) Beaufort. Merks died in 1409.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>28</sup> Eubel, II, 166, 231; Stubbs, 199.

<sup>29</sup> Eubel, I, 244; Stubbs, 198.

<sup>30</sup> Eubel, I, 260; Stubbs, 199.

<sup>31</sup> Stubbs, 198.

The other retired bishop was John Hunden, who resigned Llandaff in 1475. Why he did so is not known but he had already received a royal pardon for some unknown transgression four years previously, February 21st, 1471. Had he been on the wrong side during the Wars of the Roses? He retired to the Dominican house at King's Langley of which he had formerly been prior, and with this as his headquarters he occasionally went out to do duty for the Bishop of Lincoln. In 1476 he buried one Abbot of St. Albans, and a month later, August 11th, he solemnly blessed a new one, the well-known William of Wallingford, who returned his good offices by presenting him to the living of Luton in Bedfordshire.<sup>32</sup>

It will probably have been already noticed how many of the auxiliaries were members of religious orders, more especially of the mendicant ones, and the explanation may be that the distant sees held by them were not in the eyes of the Popes irrevocably lost and they preferred to appoint to them men who would be free to set out for these distant dioceses in the event of a great and successful military crusade against the Moslem power. Stable bodies, such as the secular clergy and the monastic orders, were not of their nature fitted for such peregrinations. At any rate it seems clear that the bishops *in partibus* of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were not appointed by Rome with the express intention of assigning them as auxiliaires to particular dioceses. During that period a bishop wanting help seems to have issued a license to some validly consecrated prelate residing in England, and the license was for a certain period. Late in the fifteenth we find the modern method of assigning an auxiliary to one particular bishop, and his appointment was no longer a temporary one, neither was he allowed to exercise episcopal functions beyond the bounds of the diocese to which he was assigned. In rank he preceded all the diocesan officials, but enjoyed no jurisdiction either in spirituals or temporals. The problem of providing him with a living was usually solved by presenting him to some rich living in the gift of the diocesan, but sometimes he received a fixed salary. In 1317 the Archbishop of York allowed David, *Episcopus Recreensis*, the sum of

<sup>32</sup> Rymer's *Foedera*, II, 734; *Regist. of John Whethamstede*, Rolls Series, II, 141, 159, 221.

ten marks; and in 1344 a like sum to Ralph Kelly, Bishop of Leighlin; but to Thomas Salkeld, Bishop of Chrysopolis, he gave an annual salary of forty marks.<sup>33</sup> Perhaps the first two were only casual, not full-time, workers. Neither apparently did John Egglescliffe, Bishop of Glasgow, working in the same diocese between 1318 and 1320, draw regular pay, for in the latter year Melton, the Archbishop, wrote on his behalf to Rome asking for some provision for the unfortunate prelate whom he describes as in such a state of indigence that he was forced to live on his relations who seemingly could ill afford to keep him.<sup>34</sup> What were his own brethren, the Yorkshire Dominicans, doing? Surely they could have kept him, for they had five very large houses in the county. The auxiliaries who did duty for the Italian bishops of Worcester between 1497 and 1535 must have done very well if they were all paid on the same scale as Ralph Heylesden, Bishop of Ascalon, a Franciscan, who between 1503 and 1523 drew one hundred and fifty golden ducats a year.<sup>35</sup>

If in mediæval England it was considered desirable and even necessary that diocesan bishops should occupy the chief offices in the Government, it is to their credit that they chose their auxiliaries from among men for the most part of outstanding merit. Time and again we read in the Bulls of provision to the titular sees that the nominee was a Master in Sacred Theology and this meant in those days that he had spent a considerable number of years teaching theology in a university. Amongst the Dominicans the same degree still requires fourteen years of such teaching. With a competent Vicar-General, and a reputable theologian as his auxiliary, the bishop could attend to his duties as Chancellor or Treasurer of England with a comparatively easy conscience. Some of the auxiliaries were men of considerable theological renown. Thomas Walleys of Lyncostomium, auxiliary of London in 1353, is identified by some writers with a prolific author of the same name who left behind him forty-nine folio volumes and disputed with Pope John XXII concerning the Beatific Vision.<sup>36</sup> Some of

<sup>33</sup> Stubbs, 195, 196.

<sup>34</sup> *Letters from the Northern Registers*, p. 300.

<sup>35</sup> Stubbs, 200.

<sup>36</sup> Stubbs, 196.

his works are of such merit that they have been attributed to Saint Thomas Aquinas. Andrews and Bottisham have both been mentioned as Masters of the Sacred Palace, namely official theologians to the Pope. Walter Jorz, who resigned Armagh in 1311 and as has been stated acted for the Bishop of Lincoln, established his headquarters in the Dominican Priory at Oxford where he had formerly taught theology. He, like Walleys, left many works, and enjoyed a great reputation in his time.<sup>37</sup> But by far the most interesting figure in the list of auxiliaries is that of Thomas Scrope of Bradley in Norfolk. After trying his vocation amongst the Benedictines, Dominicans, and Franciscans, he entered the Carmelite Priory at Norwich, where he lived as an anchorite in a cell adjoining the church. In 1425 his Superiors sent him out to preach, which he did with astonishing success. Twenty-five years later (1450) he was nominated Bishop of Dromore but seems not to have set foot in his diocese, and soon afterwards resigned his see; but all the time he was a bishop he acted as auxiliary to the bishops of Norwich until about 1480 he was sent as Papal Delegate to the Island of Rhodes, where the Knights of St. John were putting up an heroic and successful resistance against an overwhelming army of Turks. After the final repulse of the invaders in 1481 Scrope returned to his convent at Norwich, leaving it only to perform episcopal functions or to tramp the countryside barefooted carrying the Gospel teachings to the neglected peasantry. He died, venerated on all sides as a saint, on January 15th, 1491, aged nearly a hundred years.<sup>38</sup>

Of the thirteen titular bishops acting as auxiliaries in 1535 all seem to have accepted the Supremacy at least implicitly and continued to help their diocesans. Four of them had the good fortune to survive until Mary's reign and they died in communion with the Holy See. They were Thomas Chetham, Bishop of Sidon, and Thomas Hallam, Bishop of Philadelphia—both Austin Canons; William Fawell, Bishop of Hippo, and Robert King, Abbot of Osney, who was Bishop of Rheon in 1535, of Osney in 1542, and of Oxford in 1545. He died in 1557. One of the titulars, Matthew Mackarell, Abbot

<sup>37</sup> Quétif and Echard, *Scriptores Ord. Praed.*, I, 513.

<sup>38</sup> McCaffrey, *The White Friars*. Gill, Dublin, 1926. *passim*.

of the Premonstratensian Canons of Barlings, Bishop of Chalcedon, and auxiliary bishop of Lincoln, expiated his early approval of Schism by dying on the scaffold in 1535, one of the martyrs of the Pilgrimage of Grace. With these men the long line of English bishops *in partibus* ceased until the days of the Vicars Apostolic, but as diocesans still required help Henry used the plenitude of his newly-gotten Supremacy to allocate twenty-six titular sees in England to which auxiliary bishops could be appointed as occasion required. Fifteen of these new sees *in partibus Angliae* received pastors in Henry's time, and some of these men lived well on into Elizabeth's reign, but Robert Pursglove, Bishop of Hull, formerly Prior of the Austin Canons of Guisborough, in Yorkshire, was the only survivor who refused to relapse into schism; having returned to the Church in Mary's reign he now remained steadfast, and he was allowed to retire unmolested to his native town of Tideswell, where he spent his fortune in founding the Grammar School there. He died in 1579 and his tomb can still be seen in the beautiful "Cathedral of the Peak."



## THE INTERPRETATION OF THE HEXAEMERON

(Concluded)

BY THE REV. E. F. SUTCLIFFE, S.J., M.A.

**B**EFORE proceeding to ask in what sense the inspired writer intended his narrative to be taken, it is still necessary to discuss the use by the sacred writer of two different words to designate the divine productive activity of the six days. These two words are *bara* and '*asah*', which St. Jerome translates in the Vulgate account of creation respectively, *creare* (always) and *facere* (generally). From the use of these two words some have wished to deduce a difference in the nature of the divine activities in question. The word *Bara* in its simple form, or *kal*, as it is called, is never used of any except divine activity; but it does not always denote creation out of nothing. Thus man as a whole composed of soul and body was not created directly out of nothing, as his body was formed of the slime of the earth, Gen. ii, v. 7; yet in c. i, v. 27, the word *Bara* is thrice used of his creation. This is still clearer from the use of the word in Isaias c. xliii, v. 15: "I am the Lord, your Holy One, the creator of Israel, your King." The word '*asah*', on the other hand, is the ordinary expression for "make," and is used indifferently of men and of God. But just as the sense of creation out of nothing is not conveyed by *bara* apart from its context, so the word '*asah*', like its English counterpart "make," can be used, when the context warrants it, to signify the particular idea of creation out of nothing. Thus in c. ii, v. 4: "These are the generations of the heaven and the earth, when they were created (*bara*), in the day that the Lord God made ('*asah*') the heaven and the earth." Again in v. 21: "God created the great whales, and every living and moving creature, which the waters brought forth, according to their kinds." Here the word used is *bara*; whereas of terrestrial animals the word used is '*asah*': "God made the beasts of the earth according to their

kinds, and cattle, and everything that creepeth on the earth after its kind," v. 25. No one, I think, will wish to establish a difference between the manner of creation of the living things of the waters and of the earth. These examples show how precarious would be any argument based on the use of the one word rather than the other.

Let us now turn to consider the work of some of the days to see in what sense the author intended his words. The sun, moon, and stars were made on the fourth day: "God made two great lights . . . (the sun and the moon) . . . and the stars," v. 16. The sun and moon are both spoken of as great lights in comparison to the stars. As the moon is vastly smaller in reality than the stars, it is clear that the sacred writer does not wish to speak of the actual facts of the physical world, but only of appearances, and according to the current usage of men. Again, the earth is spoken of as created before the sun, the earth on the first day and the sun on the fourth. But if what science teaches is correct, the earth was thrown off from the sun as a molten mass, and caught up in the orbit of the parent body; and the sun must have existed before the earth. The sun is conceived as a body as large as it appears to the eye to be, and placed on the under-surface of the firmament of heaven to rule the day. This is shown by the verse quoted above, where the size of the sun and moon is spoken of according to their apparent relation to the size of the stars. Moreover, light was created on the first day, and the sun, from which the light of the earth comes, was created only on the fourth day. Again, the writer is not pretending to set down the realities of nature; for it is clear that the light of the first day is solar light. It cannot be maintained that there is reference here to some light that existed in the remote past before the creation or formation of the sun, partly because the existence of such light could only have been known through revelation, and we have seen that we must not look in Scripture for revelations from Almighty God concerning the secrets of nature, and partly because the text clearly indicates the contrary. For the initial period of darkness with the first period of light which followed, together constitute the first day, made up in the Bible phrase of evening and of morning. But the

length of the days are regulated by the revolution of the earth on its axis, and the light of the day is the light of the sun. It is the presence or absence of the light of the sun which distinguishes day from night, v. 5. The trees and plants, as we have seen, were made on the third day before the creation of the sun on the fourth day. This again goes to show that the narrative is not intended to correspond with reality, as it is difficult to conceive how the vegetable world could flourish without the light and warmth of the sun.

Lastly, the description of the firmament of heaven as a solid vault shows that the narrative cannot be taken literally. According to the Douay Version: "God made a firmament, and divided the waters that were under the firmament, from those that were above the firmament," v. 7. This translation follows the Vulgate in using the word "were" in the past tense. In the Hebrew there is no verb; and the sense demands the present. It was only after the creation of the firmament that there could be waters above it. From a comparison of other texts we see that the Hebrews imagined the firmament as a solid dome fixed over the earth, on the under side of which were placed the sun, moon, and stars, and on the upper side of which were the upper waters. By means of apertures these upper waters could descend on the earth, when God wished to refresh it with rain, Gen. ii. 5. This is a very natural way of representing things and keeps closely to appearances. According to Gen. c. i, v. 8, another name for this firmament is heaven, though, be it noted, the word "heaven" has in the Bible other meanings also. Let me illustrate by some quotations. Thus Eliu in Job c. xxxvii. v. 18, speaks of "the heavens, which are most strong, as if they were of molten brass." In psalm cxlviii, vv. 4f, the psalmist sings:

Praise Him, ye heaven of heavens;  
And let all the waters that are above the heavens  
Praise the name of the Lord.

The sources from which the waters of the great Flood were derived, are thus described, Gen. c vii, v. 11: "All the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the flood gates of heaven were opened; and the rain fell upon the earth forty days and forty nights." These flood gates are what have been described above as apertures

in the firmament. The Revised Version has "the windows of heaven." So also in c. viii, v. 2: "The fountains of the deep and the flood gates of heaven were shut up, and the rain from heaven was restrained." When in Malachy God promises rain and therewith abundance, the promise is to "Open the flood gates of heaven, and pour you out a blessing even to abundance," Mal. c. iii, v. 10. Cf. Isai. xxiv. 18; 4 Kings vii. 2, 19. There can I think, be no doubt in the light of these texts that the account here given represents the conceptions current among the Hebrews and reflected in their manner of expressing themselves. There is nothing astonishing in the adoption of such conceptions, as they faithfully reflect the appearances that strike our senses, and as this account of the universe was defended by several of the Fathers as giving a correct description of the facts of nature, as may be seen from the pages of a Lapide.

If the above paragraphs have given an accurate interpretation of the texts, it follows that the first chapter of Genesis cannot be understood in its literal sense to give an account of the universe or of its origin that mirrors the actual facts of nature underlying the phenomena, and that it cannot, without violence, be so interpreted as to bring it into line with the ascertained truths of the physical sciences. It remains to show that the author has manifested his mind by showing that he had no intention of describing the ultimate facts of nature. This he has done in two ways. First, by the artificial and artistic scheme that he follows, which I now briefly recall to mind. It will be remembered that on its first creation, the earth was covered with waters, and above the waters reigned darkness. There were thus three layers or divisions, darkness, waters, earth. In this order, beginning from above, he describes the preparation of the earth for the reception of its living inhabitants. First, light is created, and light is separated from darkness. Secondly, the firmament is created, and thereby the upper waters are separated from the lower waters on the earth. Thirdly, the dry land is made to appear by the separation of the lower waters from the earth and their gathering into one place. Then, on the same third day, almost as part of the earth in which they are rooted, are produced grass, plants, and trees. The universe of heaven and earth being now

prepared for the reception of its moving and living inhabitants, there follows the account of the work of a second triduum, in which the same order is again followed. First, the firmament is provided with the celestial bodies, which move about upon its face. Then the waters are peopled with whales and fishes, and the air with birds. And thirdly, comes the population of the dry land, namely, the animals and man. This schematic order is an indication that the writer is giving a word-painting artificial and artistic.

A second striking indication is provided by the information that on the fourth day lights were made "in the firmament of heaven to divide the day and night," v. 1. But we have already been told that on the first day God "divided the light from the darkness; and He called the light Day, and the darkness Night," vv. 4 and 5. Moreover, the writer tells us that lights, or luminaries, were made in the firmament of heaven to be "for days and years," v. 14. These lights were made on the fourth day; yet there had preceded three days without these heavenly bodies to mark off the days. What is this but to tell us that he is not intending to depict things as they really happened, but in a graphic and striking way to bring home to his readers that the whole universe, heaven and earth, and all that is in them, was created and prepared by the power and wisdom of God. That is the all-important lesson he wishes to inculcate. There is but one God, and He is the Author and Creator of all things. What does it matter to salvation whether plants or sea-animals were first formed? Such things the inspired writer has no mind to teach us, and has manifested the fact. He does wish to teach that the heavenly bodies are created for the good of man, that they are not divine, that being created by God for the sake of man, they can exercise no fatal or malign influence on his destiny. He does wish to teach that there are not two eternal principles, one of good and one of evil, the former creator of the soul of man and of the spiritual world; the latter creator of the material universe. He does wish to teach that matter is not intrinsically evil, created as it is by the hand of God. He does wish to teach that there is one and one only God, not a multitude of deities, as the pagan nations around fondly imagined.



It is extremely important to notice that fundamentally the first chapter of Genesis is historical. It records and teaches the opening fact in the history of the world, namely, that it was created by God, a Being external to and anterior to the universe He created. But the drama of creation as displayed before our eyes in six successive scenes of as many days the writer has intimated to be only an artificial and artistic way of inculcating with greater emphasis than is possible in a single sentence the sublime truth he wishes to imprint in the minds of his readers that God is the Author and Creator of All. Hence if it is necessary to give a label to the above interpretation of the Hexaemeron, it should be called historico-artistic or historico-logical. Readers of modern manuals treating of our subject will understand this providing of a name or label.

The reader may be reminded that there is nothing new in the view that the six days were not meant by the inspired writer to signify six successive periods of time corresponding objectively to successive divine acts. Not only Origen (Migne, *Patr. Gr.* 11, 376ff), but also St. Athanasius (ibid. 26, 276), and St. Augustine (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* 34, 231), have expressed the view that all things were created by God at one and the same time. Moreover, no objection can be urged against the above exposition on the ground that the institution of the Sabbath rest is referred to the fact that God performed the work of creation on six days and rested on the seventh. In the first place, just as God is only improperly said to have "worked" on the six days, so Christ by a similar use of language saying that: "My Father worketh until now" John v. 17, may, if the words are unduly pressed, be taken to imply that the Father "worked" also on the seventh day. But the truth is that, as indicated above, the sacred author implies that his days are only schematic. None the less they formed a suitable object-lesson for the chosen people in the observance of the Sabbath-rest.

POSTSCRIPT.—This article was in the hands of the Editors before the appearance of Dr. Messenger's able book *Evolution and Theology*, which was published on November 16th, 1931. I am glad to be able to quote some of his remarks, p. 13: "A consideration of (Gen. c. 1), especially in its context, will show us that the universe, the origin of which is thus attributed to



God, is the universe as it existed when Moses wrote. The things then in existence—the sun which then shone, the plants and animals then in existence—had all been created by God. There is no intention to speak of geological epochs or astronomical phases which indeed were then unknown.” With these sentences I find myself in entire agreement. Indeed, the point of view here expressed by Dr. Messenger seems to me the only one which allows a correct understanding of the chapter as a whole. And from the above statement it appears to be a necessary conclusion that just as Moses was not concerned with the geological and astronomical processes to which the formation of the earth and the stars, as he knew them, was due, neither was he concerned with the biological processes to which animal life, as he knew it, may have been due. On the origin of irrational creatures, apart from the general truth that like all the universe they owed their being to God the Creator, he was free, according to the teaching of Leo XIII, to speak as men of his day spoke. Whether spontaneous generation is a fact or not, or possible or not, is a scientific question, just as is the geocentric theory of the universe. Hence I submit that Dr. Messenger’s statement on p. 16: “Scripture really teaches spontaneous generation,” is not justified by the expressions of Gen. c. 1. Those expressions may justify the conclusion that the contemporaries of Moses believed in spontaneous generation, but not that it is the teaching of Scripture. In the words of St. Augustine, already quoted, and adopted by Leo XIII, “The Spirit of God . . . had no will to teach these matters to men, as they would not have been means for promoting their salvation.” If the view set out in this article is the correct one, it has the immense advantage that it sets us altogether free from the conclusions of physical science in the interpretation of Scripture. We shall not have to revise our exegesis in the light of more recent discoveries; and whatever discoveries may be made, they can never be in conflict with the Bible. This aloofness from the progress of purely human knowledge is surely in accord with the dignity of Holy Scripture.

## SATISFACTION

QUIDQUID BONI FECERIS ET MALI SUSTINUERIS.

BY THE VERY REV. T. CANON SHEEHAN.

**A**N Essay on Cardinal Manning, in which the virtues and faults of the great ecclesiastic are freely discussed, concludes by applying to him the pathetic blessing of the Church: "Quidquid boni feceris et mali sustinueris sint tibi in remissionem peccatorum."

The words are taken from the prayer usually recited by the priest after Absolution: "May the Passion of Our Lord Jesus Christ, the merits of the Blessed Virgin Mary and all the saints, whatsoever good you do and evil you endure, be to thee unto forgiveness of sin, increase of grace and reward of life everlasting. Amen." This prayer is well worthy of attention because of the claims for special efficacy put forward on its behalf; if these are well-founded, the petition would fill up something that is alleged to be lacking in our modern attitude towards that part of the sacrament of penance known as Satisfaction. There is now a tendency to make adverse comment on the very mild penances that are being imposed in the Sacred Tribunal, as insufficient to repair the evil done by offending God and as producing in the mind of the sinner an inadequate notion of the malice of sin.

The object of the sacrament of penance is the full remission of sin, not only of the guilt but also of the debt of temporal punishment. If a sinner went to Confession and got a penance fully proportioned to his sins and performed it, he would be freed from all debt of temporal punishment. But the fully proportioned penance can very rarely be given. Canon 887, it is true, commands the Confessor to impose a salutary and suitable penance according to the number and kind of sins and the condition of the penitent; the Council of Trent, too, warned the priest not to connive at sin and deal too indulgently with the sinner by enjoining very light works for very great crimes; and there is universal agreement that it would be seriously wrong, unless in exceptional cases, to impose a trifling penance for a very grave sin.

Despite all this, however, the custom of imposing only moderate penances has become prevalent in our day. There is much to be said for leniency. Satisfaction has a two-fold purpose: one penal, to pay the temporal debt for past offences; the other medicinal, to preserve the penitent from falling again. The latter is the more necessary of the two and the penitent's spiritual welfare in the future must be carefully considered when a penance

is being imposed. The Council of Trent, notwithstanding its insistence on the need of grave penance, recommended prudence in the matter and counselled the priest to take into account the penitent's spiritual weakness and to exercise moderation accordingly. Long before the Council of Trent St. Thomas had taught that it was not advisable to burden the penitent with a great weight of satisfaction, because as a small fire might be extinguished by a great load of fuel placed upon it, so a slight movement of sorrow just aroused in a penitent might be extinguished by a penance too severe and the sinner himself driven to despair (Quodl. 3, a. 28). Gerson says, in a passage approved by St. Francis de Sales, that it is safer to give a small penance which is freely accepted and likely to be fulfilled, and thus lead the sinner to Purgatory, rather than a large penance which he will not perform, and thus drive him into Hell. A light penance, it is true, does not cover the whole debt of punishment due to a sin; a large one must be regarded as more effective in making satisfaction; and the traditional teaching is, according to Billot (De Poen. Th., 20), that the efficacy of a penance is in proportion to its severity, yet out of consideration for human infirmity very severe penances are no longer inflicted.

This must involve something of spiritual loss, for the prayers and good works ordered in Confession have a sacramental value which makes them surpass all other penitential exercises. St. Thomas (Quodl. 3, a. 28) says that since the satisfaction enjoined by the priest in Confession is a part of the sacrament of penance it is manifest that in performing it, the power of the Keys is being put into operation. Billot teaches that the penance given in Confession offers to the penitent a means of expiation easier and more effective than anything he can undertake on his own behalf. "The Council of Trent," writes the Abbot of Buckfast in the *Buckfast Chronicle* for March, 1931, "has defined that satisfaction is one of the three parts that constitute the matter of the sacrament of penance. Through this Divine arrangement spiritual deeds of a transient nature and of a light calibre acquire an immense value precisely because they are willed by Christ as a participation in His own infinite satisfaction for sin."

So penetrated with the conviction of the surpassing value of sacramental penance is our modern theologian Father Vermeersch, that he deplores the apparent lack of solicitude, on the part of Confessors, that their penitents should avail of it. By ample sacramental satisfaction they would escape much Purgatorial suffering. He would have the priest, therefore, in dealing with a habitual sinner, to impose indeed a reasonable penance, but to tell him also how inadequate it is and to admonish him to gain Indulgences and to do good works; these good works he would have him enrich with the efficacy of sacramental penance by saying: "Whatsoever good works you will do for the next two days will be to you a penance" (*Theologia Moralis De Poen.*, N. 547). Vermeersch would also persuade pious penitents to request from their confessors

penances longer and more severe than they are accustomed to enjoin. For priests have shown reluctance to impose long penances on even pious penitents. This is probably accounted for by the fact that the penance given in Confession has always been regarded as an obligation to be taken very seriously and to be discharged with particular care; therefore, confessors have refrained from creating an obligation which might involve undue scruple and anxiety. Nevertheless, it must be regarded as a spiritual loss, that only a comparatively small amount of one's prayers and good works should possess the surpassing value of sacramental satisfaction. Would it be in any way possible to elevate more of our prayers and good works and impart to them this wealth of sacramental efficacy?

A great number of theologians think that the Church's intention in the prayer, *Quidquid boni feceris et mali sustinueris*, is to raise the good works and sufferings of the penitent to the dignity of sacramental satisfaction (until the punishment due to sins confessed in this present Confession is fully remitted). Great writers are of this opinion and St. Alphonsus Liguori thinks it more than probable they are right. If so, the words of the petition carry with them a great weight of meaning and are second in importance only to the words of absolution themselves.

The opinion of St. Thomas is given in the passage already quoted (*Quodl. 3, a. 28*) in which he recommends leniency in the matter of satisfaction. He has before his mind the instance of an habitual sinner with a minimum amount of sorrow. The occasion is one, therefore, for the exercise of great discretion. The saint's teaching may be paraphrased here. The priest is to explain to the sinner what a severe penance would be his if he got one proportioned to his crimes. He is then to impose a penance mild, tolerable and in every way suited to the weakness of the penitent; at the same time he is to recommend him, without obliging him, to perform certain works of penance, and these works receive greater force from the general injunction, *Quidquid boni feceris et mali sustinueris*. For this reason the prayer is said *laudabiliter* by many priests.

It was on the authority of St. Thomas and St. Antoninus that St. Alphonsus Liguori formed his opinion that this prayer does probably communicate sacramental merit to the works of the penitent. The teaching of St. Antoninus is contained in his discussion as to how a confessor ought to treat habitual sinners. The priest, he says, ought to give a penance which he thinks likely to be fulfilled; if a sinner acknowledges that he has committed grave sins but declares himself unable to perform a hard penance, the confessor should animate him by pointing out the heinousness of his sins and the penance and punishment they deserve. Let him then impose a penance with the hope that the sinner will accept it. If he does not, the confessor may at least rejoice that he has translated him from hell to purgatory. But never let him allow the sinner to depart in despair; rather

let him give a penance of one Pater Noster or something similar, and whatsoever good he shall do or evil he shall endure let it be to him for a penance.

St. Thomas of Villanova bids the confessor to temper the rigour of penance in such a way that undue mildness may not lead the sinner to under-estimate the malice of sin, or undue severity lead him to omit the penance; this, he says, the priest will accomplish, if he will impose a light penance of obligation and counsel a severe one; but he is to be careful to apply sacramental efficacy to the latter penance which the sinner has undertaken willingly.

Both St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Thomas of Villanova and in our own day Vermeersch speak of imposing one penance and counselling another. The confessor is bound to inflict a penance, but according to Lacroix he may advise another and impart to the latter the force of sacramental efficacy (De Poen., 1249). One practical objection to it is that it would take so long to explain to people what is obligatory and what is not. At the same time we must be alive to the great danger there is that from the small penances imposed, sinners may go away with an utterly inadequate idea of the malice of sin; a man who has missed Mass for years and piled up a long record of positive sins should not be allowed to depart under the misapprehension that the Litany of the Holy Name three times is a penance in some way proportioned to the atrocious neglect of which he has been guilty.

Although Lacroix does not seem to think that the petition renders all the future works of the penitent equal to sacramental satisfaction, yet he attributes to it some special efficacy. Though not instituted by Christ yet it was, he says, instituted by His Church which has power to grant Indulgences and the words themselves are not only a prayer but have something of the character of an authoritative sentence or declaration (De Poen., 1250).

Noldin's opinion is expressed in his discussion as to what is essential and what is not essential in the Form of Absolution given in the Ritual. It is important for a priest to know this when there is a crowd of penitents and he is pressed for time. But although the prayer "Passio . . ." is a non-essential yet he asks the priest not to omit it, since in the opinion of Theologians of weight it elevates the good works of the penitent to the merit of sacramental satisfaction. Even if the priest is very much pressed for time he recommends him to recite it as the penitent is leaving the confessional rather than that any soul should be deprived of the benefits contained in it. At the same time he is careful to show that the opinion can hold good only with certain restrictions. The power of the keys exercised by the priest can extend, as far as guilt and punishment are concerned, only to sins which are here and now submitted to that power in the sacrament of penance. Therefore, not all future good



works come within the range of this prayer, but those only that are sufficient to meet the debt of temporal punishment of sins acknowledged in this confession.

Vermeersch says that the prayer may be omitted without sin, but that in view of the spiritual good of the penitent it ought to be recited since in the opinion of many it attaches to the good works of the penitent a special expiatory force and renders them equal to sacramental satisfaction.

Even if the prayer does not accomplish all that is claimed for it by some of the foregoing Theologians, yet it may at least be interpreted as an appeal for actual grace to enable the penitent to sanctify his works and sufferings. The Council of Trent teaches that satisfaction for sin is performed not only by the three penitential works: prayer, fasting and almsgiving, but also by bearing with patience the sufferings inflicted on us by God. On leaving the confessional the penitent goes forth to his daily work and the troubles of life. If he could serve those whom he has to serve as if he were doing it for Christ Himself, if he could accept the pains and sorrows of life as if they were crosses presented to him by his suffering Redeemer, he would soon fill up whatsoever was wanting in the penance given him by the priest when he was loosed from guilt. At the very least, therefore, the words in question contain an appeal for actual help to enable the penitent to sanctify the works and sufferings of his life.

However we may interpret the prayer, the Confessor should never lose sight of the curative or remedial purpose of sacramental Satisfaction. There is a noticeable tendency towards uniformity; the same litanies and the same prayers are imposed in Confession after Confession. It should be remembered that not only is the penitent bound to make atonement for past sin but also an effort is to be made so that he may be restored to full spiritual vigour. To read a chapter of the Imitation of Christ for a week would at least insure some serious thinking on the truths of salvation. Probably we have allowed ourselves to be influenced too much by the fear that the penitent may forget his penance when it is drawn out over several days, but if a really effective penance can be discovered it would be a pity to refrain from imposing it because of an apprehension such as this which may be quite unfounded. The uniformity of our penances might also be relieved by prescribing an offering of money to some charity or another; it would be spiritually very beneficial to some penitents if their attention were drawn to the needs of the church or the poor. If prayer is to be prescribed the Penitential Psalms have every claim on our attention. They are not too long, it takes not more than five minutes to say them. They are most appropriate for the contrite in heart and the afflicted in spirit. To David it was revealed that it was to his sins all his sufferings were due: the boastfulness of his enemies, the treachery of his friends, the heaviness and darkness of his soul, the lack of health in his flesh and of rest



in his bones. But although they seem to be principally concerned with the *reatus poenae*, yet running throughout the seven Psalms there is deep tenderness of devotion to God, there is utter helplessness yet with every hope in the Divine compassion, there is lowly confession of sin with pathetic pleading for mercy eloquent in its humility. Indeed, the psalms may be said to breathe forth the pure essence of prayer :

Turn not away Thy face from me

Lest I be like to them that go down into the pit

Make me to hear Thy mercy in the morning

For in Thee have I hoped

Make me to know the way wherein I should walk

For to Thee have I lifted up my soul

Deliver me from my enemies, O Lord

Unto Thee have I fled

Teach me to do Thy will

For Thou art my God

(Psalm 142).

But it is clearly desirable that everything we do and everything we suffer should possess a spiritual value. The Church's prayer after absolution is modest and pathetic. All her children have, in discharging the duties of their state of life, to render service to others and all, too, have their measure of pain and sorrow to endure; but our works are often wasted for want of a right intention and our sufferings spoiled by murmuring and impatience. It is the desire of our loving mother to gather up the fragments of good that remain despite our wasted lives and lost opportunities and thus she prays that whatsoever good we do or evil we suffer may be to us unto the remission of sin, the increase of grace and the reward of eternal life.

## HOMILETICS

BY THE REV. H. E. CALNAN, D.D.

*Sixteenth Sunday after Pentecost (September 4th).*

*Gospel : Luke xiv. 1-11.*

*The Gospel Incident.* It was now but a few months before Our Lord's Passion. The Pharisees and lawyers had long since been "lying in wait for him, and seeking to catch something from his mouth that they might accuse him" (Luke xi.). And here we have an example of their methods, and of Our Lord's amazing patience. But willing to save them too, Our Lord did not disdain their invitation to table. He thus takes the occasion of a trap which they hoped to spring on Him, to demonstrate, both to their senses and to their intelligence, that He has both power and authority to decide what is right and wrong.

The situation, on this Sabbath, had apparently been engineered to embarrass Him. There was the man with dropsy. If Christ healed him, He broke the Sabbath. If He did not, it would be because He could not or did not dare. In either event His authority would be damaged. And in half a dozen deft words, as usual, Our Lord showed the Pharisees that unless they could dismantle it they had ensnared not Him but themselves. The prohibition which they claimed to deduce from the Law, was against common practice and common sense. The claims of flesh and blood (if *ὄνος* should be *ὥς*), and of property in danger, were urgent even on the Sabbath. To relieve distress is to serve God.

### A.

Christ condemned the Pharisees because He loved mankind. Modern enemies of religion are fond of representing incidents of this kind as mere wordy squabbles in which Jesus scores a cheap verbal victory. The Christian can see graver issues at stake. Christ reproached the Pharisees because they were killing God's Law. And God's law secures man's welfare. The Pharisees were not merely laying intolerable and ridiculous burdens on their trusting followers: they were thereby obliterating the idea of God's Paternal Providence, God's Fatherhood.

Pharisaism, as an intellectual movement, was doubtless originally respectable. It began well, and meant well. But by Our Lord's time, the Pharisees had become blind guides leading the blind. Anxiety about public status and personal reputation had warped their sense of truth: had led to pride, and hypocrisy, and hatred of any truth that was inconvenient. And Jesus would not tolerate hypocrisy.

Moreover, they had not been "sent." And there is much

significance in the instant and undisguised opposition which they gave to men who were "sent," as the Baptist and Christ were "sent."

In Our Lord's time, they were, wittingly or unwittingly, leading the people to revolt against God's Law. For when men are misled by arbitrary and wrong-headed precepts springing from false interpretations of God's Word, sooner or later they will see the folly of it; and human nature being what it is, the gesture by which men free themselves from spurious obligations, will sweep aside the truth from which they were alleged to spring. And there mankind is injured. For God's Law, like the Sabbath, was made for man—not to suppress man, but to develop him to his full perfection. Christ condemned the Pharisees because He loved mankind.

#### B.

"How shall they preach if they be not sent?" (Rom. x. 15). What the Pharisees did for the Torah, has been done for Christian morality by later teachers of religion, self-appointed. The propagation, during the past few centuries, of doctrines such as Justification by Faith alone, or by confidence in Christ, Private Judgment, Puritanism and Repression, has produced the reaction that had to come. It expresses itself to-day in a cry for the abolition of creeds and dogmas, the denial of practical religious Authority and of specifically religious sanctions. We are bidden, to-day, to agree that Christ could not legislate for the conditions of the twentieth century. Our Lord's methods of securing human welfare have been rejected for methods which promised more ready results.

It is all part of the reaction from the perceived folly of doctrines preached by men who were not "sent." A statesman of the last generation could see the trend of things, and uttered the warning that from the day when the divorce between Christianity and human thought is complete, will date the irremediable beginning of the radical collapse of civilization in the world (Gladstone at Glasgow University, 1879). And, to-day, were it not for the voice of the Catholic Church, the highest idea of moral obligation in the world would be a medley of naturalistic principles, ranging anywhere from an ideal of social service for the betterment of the race to the baldest of crude sentiment. From this too, there is evidence of a reaction. For what was once a murmur is now a shriek that "temperament," "passion," "love," "self-expression," are a law unto themselves, imperative, inexorable, supreme. Having been led to rule out the information, orders and advice of Jesus Christ, men have taken their own way to find a norm of right and wrong. And, to-day, a thing is lawful if it is useful or kind. Sin is whatever is cruel or harsh.

#### C.

Any Catholic, then, who would do his duty to his fellow men to-day, has there his line of action. We must make our con-

temporaries see that Jesus Christ is God, yesterday and to-day and for ever. He intended His information, commands, and advice, to reach all men in every future century. As a practical Man, He took practical steps to secure this end; and as God, He secures the actual effectiveness of those steps. His teaching, therefore, is within easy reach of the ordinary man of ordinary sincerity. The organization which He set going, is working to-day under His complete control; for He Himself lives and acts in it, and through it, and with it. The Church could not fail in its task if it tried; for He has guaranteed that He will never let it.

In no other way can we know with certainty what the Creator of mankind has laid down for mankind's welfare. In no other way, therefore, can we make that welfare secure. This is no shoddy pragmatism: this is not the error of those who forget that man's destiny is supernatural. It is the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of Christ, in the terms into which those mysteries have been translated by the Sacred Human Heart of Jesus Christ.

"Is it lawful?" The final answer is God's answer. And I am to know what God has revealed by the testimony, teaching and authority of the Catholic Church.

*Seventeenth Sunday after Pentecost (September 11th).*

*Gospel: Matt. xxii. 35-46.*

*Occasion.*—The incidents here related took place in the Temple. Forty-eight hours later, "they crucified Him." Our Lord seems to have spent the whole of this Wednesday in a prolonged effort to win over His enemies. "What think you of Christ?" is His question here. The effort failed; and the failure throws important light on the nature of the Faith for which Christ calls.

#### A.

Our Lord, being God, could have compelled the submission of the Pharisees, as of everyone else, by sheer force of His Divine Personality. But the result would have been a subjection little different from that given to God by irrational creatures. All created things, even the most blatant of Christ's enemies, are necessarily subject to God by the very force of their created nature. From rational agents is due a more complete submission, bearing the imprint of man's spiritual faculties of intelligence and will.

Again, a lesser man than Our Lord, might have turned his enemies into friends by sheer oratorical eloquence, sweeping them up on a wave of emotional excitement, stampeding their powers of thought. But again the result would not have been Faith. More than once the emotions of Our Lord's audience did, in fact, run away with them: and He took prompt steps to check the outburst. Emotions can cry "Crucify Him" as easily as "Let us make Him our king."

Faith was Our Lord's object: not revivalist enthusiasm. Emotional religiosity, however clamorous, however restrained, however sublimated into poetry or music or the measured dignity of ceremonial, is not Faith. For revivalist enthusiasm, however sustained, can be, and often is, flagrantly defiant of reason and of will.

Our Lord was often concerned to demonstrate the falsity of the Pharisees' reasoning and the insincerity of their methods, because the Faith required from them, as from us, must be a judgment made by the understanding directed by goodwill. The Pharisees' failure to believe had its root precisely in the crookedness of their reasoning and the malice of their will. To describe Our Lord's conflict with them as wordy warfare for a mere verbal victory is thus gross distortion. For their salvation, as well as for ours, He was willing to die; and with redoubled vigour as the last hours of His life ran out, He attacked their disease at its root. For His Sacred Human Heart had pity on all sinners, even the hypocrites who angered Him.

#### B.

Created reason, by its dependance on its Creator, is bound to give its submission to any manifestation of Eternal Uncreated Truth. That is the Faith which Christ demands. It provides a present proof of things otherwise unperceived: a present grip on the very substance of our future welfare. And because the idea of genuine Faith has been obscured and distorted into a mockery of the certitude which human reason naturally seeks, unbelievers grow daily more numerous and more actively hostile. The capital blame lies with their blind guides.

Faith is not a mere religious "persuasion" which happens to be yours because your parents held it, or because you attended some particular school or church. Millions think that it is. It is not a mere opinion or set of opinions touching the duties of this life and the probabilities of the next, liable to be upset by further scientific enquiry or any other means. It is not a quasi-religious attitude towards life and thought and action, which must grow in spirituality and clarity of vision as we progress towards perfect racial culture. Millions are told that it is. It is not identical with the knowledge which rests on human experience: experience is never complete for any man, and human knowledge is forced from time to time to contradict itself; while the object of Faith is complete and constant. Above all, Faith is not the result of experimenting with obscure or unknown psychic forces or phenomena.

Faith is a God-given power to assent to the truth of what God says, because God says it. Faith's assent is decided not by reason's ability to prove it, not by its agreement with our experience, not by its promise to make us happy, not by the approval of clever minds, not by the approval of our nearest and dearest; with or without those incidentals, our assent to

the truth of what God says is decided by the cold fact that God has said it.

## C.

This is no frustration or renunciation of human reason. It is intelligence doing its proper work, embracing certitude when it finds it. And it gets certitude not only from mathematics and experience (sometimes!), but also from the reliable word of a trustworthy informant.

Faith is not content with any spurious "religious sense." But God does give divine help, "grace," light for the intellect to see facts. And He always gives it to the mind that is honest enough to admit that it does not know everything, and will, therefore, pray for it. But He gives external criteria, too: things like prophecy and miracles. And the honest intellect examines these. Did they happen? If they did, then they show God Himself at work to vindicate the truth of what His Messenger says. The trustworthiness of the informant is established. And the evidence for the prophecy and miracles at the base of the Christian religion, is as strong as anything else in history.

But this investigation can be, and often is, baulked or abandoned through lack of goodwill, or by positive ill-will. Here again God's help is available to those who ask it.

And that is the help which Our Lord was giving so nobly and patiently to the Pharisees. They had the Law, the Prophets and the Writings. David, for instance, having called the Messiah his Son, called Him also his Lord. That, suggests Our Lord, should help the Pharisees to see that the Messiah of David was to do exactly as He Himself was doing, claiming to be God, and using God's authority and God's power before their very eyes, and at His own discretion.

*Eighteenth Sunday after Pentecost (September 18th).*

*Gospel: Matt. ix. 1-8.*

*Occasion.*—The paralysed man and his friends sought only the health of his body. But the generosity of Christ "et merita supplicum excedit et vota"; so He gives more than is asked; "Be of good heart, son, thy sins are forgiven." The Pharisees were quite right in thinking that only God could forgive sins in this authoritative fashion; but with all their zeal they should have known, both from the Prophecies and from Christ's miracles, that this was exactly the language which they could expect to hear from the Messiah. Patient still, He makes things clearer by two further acts proper to God: He reads their secret thoughts, and He cures a bodily disease by a mere command. As St. Augustine says: "They were thinking rightly about God, but they did not perceive God present. So He did something for them to see, and gave something for them to believe." (But Augustine's subtlety in "Fecit quod viderent, et dedit quod crederent" eludes the English.)



## A.

The result of forgiveness of sins is the state of "sanctifying grace." And there is a world of rich power and dignity in this state, which may be missed by minds perfectly accustomed to the phrase "in a state of grace." If the riches and inspiration of that world were more commonly perceived, the prospect of an instruction on Grace would not fill the audience (and the preacher?) with a sense of dry dismay. Let us look at it.

The "state of grace" means much more than the absence or the remission of sin. A specifically Protestant error in that direction is condemned by Trent: Sess. VII, canon 11. The justification of the sinner, being a transfer from the state of sin into the state of grace, has a double element: the remission of sin and the acceptance of justice. It is what Scripture calls a "regeneration," a "renovation." Theologians call it a gift "intrinsically inherent to the soul." Since God gave man a supernatural destiny, and since original sin obstructed that destiny, remission of sin, original or actual, carries with it also "justification." Those are the technicalities; and they are all involved when a soul in sin recovers the "state of grace." That soul recovers life only because the God whom it has attacked, gives it this gratuitous gift, itself presupposing countless other gifts, transitory indeed, but of the same supernatural character. And who shall compel God to give these gifts to the rebel? Thank God for the sweet compulsion of God's own Mother, and the Sacred Human Heart which He had from Her!

## B.

This grace is a reality of the supernatural order, a manner of being, a quality transforming the soul and raising it above even the most perfect of natural beings. Of itself it is permanent; and we can lose it only by expelling it of our own free choice, by grave sin.

The first Pope dares to say that it makes us "sharers of the divine nature." St. Paul (II Cor. xiii. 13) says it puts us into communion with the Holy Ghost. St. John (I John i. 3) calls it our companionship with the Father and His Son. It makes us not equals of God, but God-like: it gives us not the incommunicable divine life, but life similar thereto. What a wealth of instruction, rich and inspiring, fatal to the pantheistic sophistries of modern religiosity, is available here! The soul absorbing God and God's activities, as crystal absorbs light and gives it out again, as iron absorbs the fire into which it is plunged.

God thus lives in us; not merely by His power and presence and essence as He is in all His creation—"In Him we live and move and have our being," even when we rebel; but in a fuller, richer way, God gives *Himself* to us.

By Sanctifying Grace God gives Himself as a Father to His adopted children: "The Spirit Himself giveth testimony to our

spirit that we are the children of God " (Rom. viii. 15). " See the sort of love that the Father has given us, that we are called, and we are, the children of God " (1 John iii. 1). " He gave them power to *become* the sons of God, those who believe in His Name."

God gives Himself, too, as a Friend. And friendship means a certain intimacy; friends can trust each other, drop their guard, exchange confidences, help each other, entertain each other. " I call you friends, because I have told you all that I have heard from my Father."

Further, God gives Himself as the most mighty of helpers: elaborating with us into acts, His own gifts of Faith and Hope and Charity: using with us and for us, His own gifts of Wisdom, Understanding, Counsel, Fortitude, Knowledge, Piety, Fear of the Lord: guiding our lives, with us, by His own gifts of Prudence, Justice, Fortitude and Temperance: making our soul, by His activity, richer, nobler, stronger, gentler, more beautiful and more loveable in the sight of His infinite Holiness.

### C.

And the whole economy of this spiritual life springs from the merits of Jesus Christ. Thanks to His Passion and Death, not a single sin is unforgivable to the soul contrite and humble. All those graces and gifts are at our disposal, thanks to His merits. His life is the exemplar of ours. " Be ye perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect." " If you have seen me, you have seen the Father." " Learn of me for I am meek and humble of heart."

It is the life of Jesus, too, then, that we share. He is the Head of the mystical Body which gets its life from Him, and of which we are the members. And we live in Him by the freedom with which we accept His graces, imitate His virtues, and adhere to Him as branches of the living vine; " Of whose fullness we have all received."

What enormous strength, then, this life must have, thus constructed, knit, organized, thus working with all this complex supernatural power and vigour! What frightful malice must there be in the mortal sin that can wreck it!

" Be of good heart, son (notice that ' Son '), thy sins are forgiven thee."

*Nineteenth Sunday after Pentecost (September 25th).*

*Gospel: Matt. xxii. 1-14.*

*Occasion.*—This was part of Our Lord's prolonged final effort to convert the Jewish leaders a couple of days before His Passion. In a series of parables He warned them, and us, that the neglect of God-given opportunities will be punished.

## A.

To-day men say that the God who will punish is a false God, because the true God cannot be vindictive. But let us be careful of words. It is not vindictiveness that vindicates facts: it is the force of the facts themselves. And the fact is that God is Supreme and Final; and man is not.

For our information and security, God has made it clear that this life is a time of probation, and that death ends it. Death fixes the will. The New Testament is full of this doctrine. In parables such as the Wheat and the Cockle, the Net Cast into the Sea, Dives and Lazarus, Our Lord insists on this teaching. And He solemnly warns us that "the Son of Man will come . . . and then He will render to every man according to his works." He makes it clear that the judgment will turn exclusively on the works of this life. His Apostles continued that teaching: "Let us do good while we have time" (Gal. vi. 9). God, supreme and final Lord of Creation, having created each of us for an eternal destiny of supernatural happiness and perfection, has thus told us that our time for securing this destiny ceases with death. It is to depend not only on the liberality of His Will, but on the noble co-operation of ours. But the probation cannot go on for ever. As supreme Lord, He decides its term.

If death finds the will loyal to God, so the soul will remain, its destiny secure: if death finds the will hostile to God—and it cannot become so except of its own free choice—so the soul will remain for ever, in a state of hatred of all good. Ten thousand heavens would not make that soul happy, or change its evil will: the life of Heaven is a life of love of God; and to the lost soul, such a life would be mockery adding fuel to the misery of its hatred and frustration. And Heaven would cease to be Heaven. God is not mocked; for facts are inexorable.

## B.

What then becomes of God's Mercy? God's Mercy, too, cannot be finally mocked. It is mocked by the unrepentant sinner, here; and the mockery must finally end. God's mercy is beyond question for Christians. But so is the truth of Christ's intention declared by Himself, that He will say to the wicked: "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels. . . . And these shall go into everlasting punishment, but the just into life everlasting" (Matt. xxv. 41, 46). So this has always been, as it always will be, part of Christ's information held before mankind by Christ's Church, which Christ Himself controls.

Right reason, patient and dispassionate, sees no conflict here with God's Mercy. The soul which defies God's supremacy, puts itself into a state from which no human power can lift it, and which is, therefore, so far as man is concerned, perpetual. Only God's help, freely accepted, can lift that soul up: and the

impenitent soul refuses it. Final impenitence being final impenitence, the guilt remains for ever: and the penalty too.

Infinite as are God's Goodness and Mercy, in themselves as identical with God, their effects, their external operation, cannot be infinite. And it is arbitrary to claim that all should go to everlasting happiness; for the only proof that there is everlasting happiness for anyone, is precisely the statement in which Our Lord declares that some will go to everlasting punishment. If there was no truth in the warning, there was none in the promise.

### C.

But is there really material fire in Hell? The Church has not solemnly defined that there is. But the mere absence of a solemn definition does not leave opinion free. Opinion is free only when neither a definition of the Church, nor the information conveyed by Tradition or by Scripture, is thereby contradicted. And a good deal of this information, while not covered by solemn definition, is yet part of the common teaching of the Church. Catholic theologians assure us that this is an instance: the evidence being things like the language of the Liturgy, of the Catechisms, conciliar and diocesan, of the Creeds, and the "*sensus fidelium*." To deny such information, may not indeed be heresy; but it is grave and foolhardy insubordination; and it argues the temerity which makes a man his own religious authority; and that is rebellion against the authority of Christ. There are other sins besides heresy; and for absolution, sin must be retracted.

We need not, of course, imagine the sort of fire which needs oxygen and fuel. The nature and specific activity of fire do not demand that. Chemical reactions, electricity, molecular vibrations will generate heat. Someone recently announced a ray from the human eye, which could kill the life in yeast. That list does not exhaust the Omnipotence of God.

And experience shows that matter can affect spirit. A tragic or cruel spectacle, bitter or cruel words, material phenomena in themselves, vibrations, marks on paper, can torture our very soul. There is contact somewhere, though we cannot trace the transit from the corporeal to the spiritual. It is worth remembering, too, that after the General Judgment, there will be bodies as well as souls in Hell.

But that is not our destiny. It was prepared "for the devil and his angels." We cannot go there unless we choose to reject God's help and defy His Supremacy. Our destiny is to hear Christ's welcome: "*Come ye blessed of my Father, possess ye the kingdom prepared for you.*"

## NOTES ON RECENT WORK

### I. MORAL THEOLOGY AND CANON LAW.

BY THE REV. E. J. MAHONEY, D.D.

There is a growing inclination amongst educated and responsible non-Catholics, not only to respect the Catholic point of view in moral issues, but to understand and welcome it. The Government Committee appointed by the Ministry of Health to enquire into the whole question of sterilizing the unfit is, I believe, directed to consider, amongst other social effects, the strong opposition of the Catholic Church. The report is not likely to be available for some months but, in the meanwhile, the report of the Mental Deficiency Committee, set up by the British Medical Association a year ago, has appeared most opportunely, and is bound to have an effect on the deliberations of the Government Committee. The text is given as a Supplement to the *British Medical Journal*<sup>1</sup> of June 25th, 1932, and is worth serious study. The important scientific conclusion, to which attention has been drawn in the Catholic and secular Press, is that if sterilization is applied only to certifiable mental defectives the incidence of mental deficiency would not be appreciably reduced (n. 69), and that even if it were applied widely to mental defectives, there would be no appreciable difference in the number of such in the community for many generations (n. 70, i). It is admitted that in a few cases the operation might be appropriate, provided that subjects needing institutional care are not discharged from Institutions, and provided that there is supervision to prevent promiscuous sexual intercourse and the spread of venereal disease (70, ii). The "Social Considerations" of Part III of the Report include a protest against the supposition that feeble-minded persons, being unfitted for any work except of an unskilled routine character, are therefore socially useless and inefficient. As long as such tasks have to be performed the persons who do them are effective units in our social machinery (n. 103). "In general it may be said that whilst society requires to be protected from certain types of defectives, there are many mentally defective persons who require to be protected from society" (n. 104). One cannot help surmising that the influence of Dr. Letitia Fairfield, C.M.G., M.D., a member of the Committee, who prepared two Memoranda for its use, was largely responsible for the moderate tone of the Report. In this question, as in many others relating to medical ethics, this eminent lady is rendering an invaluable service to the Church. Her name does not appear on the Government Committee. In fact, there appears to be only one specialist who is a member of

<sup>1</sup> Price 1s. 3d.

both Committees, Mr. A. F. Tredgold. It would be a mistake to suppose that this report contains nothing objectionable. It concedes the desirability of sterilization in some instances and suggests it as an alternative to prohibiting the marriages of defective persons (Sub-Appendix D). It also suggests that legal provision should be made requiring intended spouses to disclose, before marriage, any significant facts of their family history. I can see no very radical objection to this, beyond the general one of discouraging State interference in the private affairs of citizens. Of much more importance are the contents of n. 71 pointing out that sterilization could be applied effectively to other physical ailments, instead of being invariably regarded as applicable only to mentally defectives. This is one more instance of a process with which we are, unfortunately, only too familiar in the spread of divorce, abortion, birth-control and other evils. Once the moral law is relaxed for the benefit of a few exceptional "hard" cases it is difficult, if not impossible, to stem the tide.

The process is observable on every side. Ten years ago, for example, the average enthusiast for birth control utterly condemned abortion. It is now advocated from the judicial bench,<sup>2</sup> as well as in popular literature. In *The Cost of English Morals* (Noel Douglas) Janet Chance makes a reflection which would, I imagine, make many of the framers of the 15th Lambeth Resolution shudder. "How marvellous it would have been, how real a revelation of human greatness if the Bishops had said: 'We have been wrong in this business of birth control, do not let us be too positive about abortion' " (p. 107). The Committee appointed last January by the Archbishop of Canterbury to consider the Lambeth Resolutions 9-19 have issued their report (1932, No. 589). It is not yet on sale to the public and its discussion in the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury took place *in camera*, but copious extracts have appeared in the *Church Times* of June 10th. The report regrets that the firm tone of the previous Conferences in 1908, 1914 and 1920 has been progressively modified, and deprecates the admission in 1930 that other methods than abstinence may be used, since this involves a change of front and the words will be torn from their context and used to the discredit of the Church. It would be easy for a critic to chide the Anglican Episcopate on their doctrinal fluctuations, but preferably one should welcome this report as a step towards undoing the harm caused by the 15th Resolution of 1930. In the absence of rigid and accepted ethical principles governing the solution of cases, men's judgment is liable to be prejudiced by the emotions and circumstances of the moment. Excellent illustra-

<sup>2</sup> A writer in the *Adelphi* for March collects the various sayings of Mr. Justice McCardie "ne pereant," and he enlarges upon the argument in a manner in which I am sure the learned judge would not do. In discovering the teaching of the "Roman Church" the writer naively says that he cannot do better than quote Lecky, from whom we gather that the wrong of abortion, and incidentally of craniotomy, consists chiefly in the death of the fetus without Baptism!



tions of this may be seen in the interesting series of "Quandaries" which have been appearing in the *Evening Standard*. Many of them are old problems which might have been lifted bodily out of Gury or any other Casuist. But the striking thing about the solutions offered by some prominent people is the fact that nearly all of them go boldly for answering "Quid ad Casum?" without relying on any guiding principle, even an erroneous principle. Casuists and Casuistry have always been, quite unjustly, in bad repute, but not even the meanest Casuist attempts to solve a case without the invocation of some principles of doctrine to guide him.

The popular literature designed for the instruction of the people in sexual matters favours the use of euphemistic terms such as "extra-marital sex life" and "termination of pregnancy," instead of "fornication" and "abortion." It is a tendency which, I think, should be resisted, for the standards of our Catholic people will unconsciously be affected by current views of morality, unless they are continually reminded of the gravely sinful nature of these practices. Public Congresses and Conferences are of the greatest value, in this respect. The lectures given at the Brussels *Congrès de la Natalité* in 1931 are now obtainable.<sup>3</sup> The Congress was arranged by the *Société Médicale Belge de Saint Luc*, the Belgian equivalent of our English *Guild of St. Luke, St. Cosmas and St. Damian*, and it appears to have been an exceptional success. The lecturers included such well-known authorities as Dr. Guchteneere, Fr. Lemaire, S.J., and Dr. Louis Vervaeck, and the subjects discussed covered almost every aspect, moral, medical and economic, of the problems connected with Birth Control and Eugenic Sterilization. The notion and practice of the virtue of Chastity and the necessity of preparing young people for the married state was also treated.

There is a new edition of the well-known work by Fr. Hoonart, S.J., *Le Combat de Pureté: A ceux qui ont vingt ans*,<sup>4</sup> which is well-adapted to the instruction of the young and, by common consent, observes both the letter and the spirit of the recent pronouncements of the Holy See on the subject of sex education, or, as a Catholic would prefer to call it, the formation of the Virtue of Chastity. The title is bellicose and justly so; for the acquiring of this virtue means, for most people, a warfare which demands some knowledge of the enemy and his method of attack. For the theologian a new and enlarged edition of *De Virtute Castitatis*,<sup>5</sup> by Fr. L. Wouters, C.SS.R., is very welcome, especially in those pages which deal with the subject of co-operation in preventing conception. Fr. J. Creusen, S.J., elucidates the principles of this matter and discusses various cases in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* for May, 1932, the third of a series of studies on the abuse of marriage. The commentary

<sup>3</sup> *Marriage et Natalité*, Editions de la Cité Chrétienne. 330 pages.

<sup>4</sup> Desclée De Brouwer. 15 fr.

<sup>5</sup> Bruges Beyaert. 141 pages. 17.50 fr.

on the Encyclical *Casti Connubii*, by Fr. Vermeersch, S.J., can now be had in an English translation.<sup>6</sup>

The many admirers of the Moral Theology of Fr. Prummer, O.P., will be glad to know that his work is appearing in a new edition (the seventh)<sup>7</sup> under the care of Dr. P. Obersiebrasse, O.P. Of more interest, perhaps, because quite new, is the second volume of Fr. Merkelbach's *Summa Theologiae Moralis, De Virtutibus Moralibus*.<sup>8</sup> The work will be completed by a third volume *De Sacramentis*.<sup>9</sup> One is entitled to ask in what respect this manual differs from others, and in particular from the work of his fellow-Dominican Fr. Prummer. The chief difference is that Fr. Merkelbach gives more space to the speculative discussion of principles than is usually found in the Manuals, and this is its chief commendation. The method is rather the reverse of what is well-expressed by Fr. Lehmkuhl in *The Catholic Encyclopædia*: "When time and leisure are wanting to add ample theoretical explanations to an extensive casuistical drill, we should not criticise him who would under these circumstances insist on the latter at the expense of the former; it is the more necessary in actual practice" (Vol. XIV, p. 611). Fr. Merkelbach insists on the former slightly at the expense, perhaps, of the latter. The major portion of the present volume is devoted to Justice. The lectures which form the basis of the work were given originally, I believe, in Louvain, though the author is teaching now in Rome at the Angelico. This will explain why it is that the civil law, when quoted, is the civil code of Belgium and France, with occasional references to the laws of other countries. It is difficult to work one's way through a treatise on Justice without some knowledge of the civil law, since so many questions are resolved in the forum of conscience by relying on the just civil laws of the locality. Croll expounded the English law admirably in his works *De Justitia, De Contractibus, De Restitutione*, books which are still of unique value. But he wrote sixty years ago and some similar series of studies, of greater depth than the work of Fr. Slater, is greatly needed amongst English speaking people. The author's treatment of the method of solving doubts of conscience follows the guiding principle of the whole work, that is to say, it is speculative to the extent of passing over all historical reference to the controversies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and it is more difficult to read than the corresponding sections in most of the Manuals. The principle *Lex dubia non obligat* is expounded with care and exactness, but the learned author rightly declines to erect it into a mechanical system for the solution of all doubts: "Quaestio de modo determinato efformandi conscientiam certam non est tanti momenti ac primo aspectu videatur et a pluribus theologis affirmetur, illum

<sup>6</sup> The America Press, New York. 77 pages. 1s. 6d.

<sup>7</sup> Herder. Vol I. 15s.

<sup>8</sup> Desclée de Brouwer. 994 pages. 40 fr.

<sup>9</sup> See CLERGY REVIEW, III, p. 154, for a notice of the first volume.

vocantes 'systema morale,' et in limine ponentes theologiae moralis ac si omnibus tractatibus dominaretur." Article IV (page 104) *De Recto et Prudenti Usu Opinionum Probabilium* is a most valuable section. Unlike the common practice of most manuals, the use of Probable opinions is discussed not in the treatise on Conscience but as part of the virtue of Prudence, and the fifty pages devoted to it are, in my opinion, the most valuable in the book. Throughout the volume there are fewer references to other authors than we are accustomed to find in manuals. In some respects this is rather a disadvantage, but the loss, if any, is more than compensated by the consistent use made not only of the *Summa* but of all the works of St. Thomas. A priest who possesses Merkelbach will at least be assured of having something which is fresh, original, and independent, in place of a collection of arguments and opinions culled from previous writers who, more often than not, follow each other "sicut oves alias oves."

For those who prefer to study the text of the *Summa* the new Marietti edition,<sup>10</sup> containing annotations from Billuart and others, is a very convenient text. In addition to the usual Indices, this edition contains a lexicon of scholastic terms. A new schematic division of the *Summa* arranged by Fr. G. M. Paris, O.P., is issued by the same publisher.<sup>11</sup> Some arrangement of this kind is absolutely necessary for an intelligent reading of a text, in which every article and every question fits into a unified scheme, like the stones of a building.

There is one other Manual, of a rather special character, which deserves mentioning. The Moral Theology of the *Salmanticenses* has always been of great authority amongst the authors, and St. Alphonsus specially relied on their opinions. In fact, a too facile quotation from the sources used by them was largely responsible for the many mis-quotations and errors in the Saint's Moral Theology, which have been amended in the excellent Gaudé edition. The original seven folio volumes had been, in recent times, reduced to two. Those two are now re-edited and brought up-to-date with the Code by the Carmelites of Burgos.<sup>12</sup> The *Compendium* preserves the spirit of the original. One cannot escape the impression of living through a past age in turning over the pages. A husband can punish his wife "cum moderatione" after two or three admonitions: "graviter tamen peccat si eam atrocius puniat." A pressing modern question, such as Eugenical Sterilization, is not fully discussed, except in so far as it affects impotence. Only two or three pages are given to Birth Control. Nevertheless, solutions of all these difficulties may be found in the principles underlying other doctrines: sterilization is only one aspect of "mutilation," and most of the intricate problems connected with Birth Control

<sup>10</sup> 8 vols. 70 lire.

<sup>11</sup> *Divisio Schematica Summae Theologicae*. 73 pages. 5 lire.

<sup>12</sup> *Compendium Salmanticense*, Tipographia "El Monte Carmelo." Burgos. 2 vols. 707 and 800 pages. £1.

are contained in the very full discussion of Co-operation. From many points of view it is preferable to have a compendium of the *Salmanticenses* which reduces the older text, calmly and serenely, without undue preoccupation with modern problems, for the principles will remain long after these problems have passed into oblivion. Topics, such as the Bulla Cruciatia, which interest Spanish subjects exclusively, are dealt with fully.

The Sulpician superior, P. Pourrat, whose four volumes, *La Spiritualité Chrétienne*, have been translated into English, has written a study of the priesthood which also deserves translation.<sup>13</sup> It presents the doctrine of the French school, on the nature of the priesthood and its sacred obligations, by judicious quotations from the writings of Bérulle, Condren, Olier, S. John Eudes and others who effected so remarkable a transformation in the French Clergy in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The value of their work consists in the fact that they popularized the ancient and traditional doctrine of the Church by the study of the Fathers. A life of S. John Eudes, by M. Joly, is now available in English.<sup>14</sup> Those who are interested in the education and formation of the priesthood will value the intimate description of the life and ideals of those who are being trained for the Foreign Missions in the famous Seminary of the Rue du Bac.<sup>15</sup>

It is sometimes said that the great need of the moral theologian and the confessor, at the present time, is a knowledge of Psychology. There is much truth in the statement if it is properly understood. For the priest with care of souls, who loves his work, will usually be a good psychologist, probably without being conscious of it. A recent work by two Anglican writers on the subject supports this contention.<sup>16</sup> The writers deal, amongst other things, with the ills of the physician, and portray the peculiarities and weaknesses of the clergy quite well. But the remarkable thing about the book is that its practical conclusions are, generally speaking, those which every priest well understands from his study of the treatise of Penance; and the authors take decidedly less account of Catholic Moral Theology than is usual in books of this kind. We cannot agree with much of the doctrine; it is at times too severe and at times vague. Nevertheless, it can be read with profit, for many of the practices, e.g., the manner of dealing with recidivists or scrupulous persons, which we have followed for generations on a principle of reliance on theological authority, are seen to be justified psychologically.

Of great importance historically, and already mentioned in the Historical Notes, Vol. III, p. 160, is *The English Church and the Papacy*, by Z. N. Brooke,<sup>17</sup> which establishes that the

<sup>13</sup> *Le Sacerdoce*, Bloud et Gay. 141 pages. 7.50 fr.

<sup>14</sup> Burnes, Oates & Washbourne. 5s.

<sup>15</sup> *Les Prêtres des Missions Etrangères*, by Georges Goyau. Grasset. 287 pages. 15 fr.

<sup>16</sup> *A Manual of Pastoral Psychology*, by Lindsay Power, B.D., and Cyril E. Hudson, M.A. Allen. 238 pages. 8s. 6d.

<sup>17</sup> Cambridge University Press. 10s. 6d.

Canon Law in England during the eleventh and twelfth centuries was the Canon Law recognized abroad in Italy or in France, i.e., the Roman Canon Law, and that there is no trace of any collection of Laws for the exclusive use of the English Church. A useful and cheap collection of Pontifical documents, in Latin with a French translation, has been regularly published for some time by La Bonne Presse;<sup>18</sup> the second volume of the Acts of Pius XI is now available. Probably, the most widely used manual of Canon Law affecting Religious Institutes is *Religieuses et Religieuses*, by J. Creusen, S.J. It can now be had in an English translation from the fourth (1930) French edition.<sup>19</sup> An official translation of the Canons concerning Religious has been in existence since 1919,<sup>20</sup> but a commentary of some kind is absolutely necessary.

Cappello's *Tractatus Canonico-Moralis, De Sacramentis*, is rapidly approaching completion. The latest edition to the series is Vol. II, Pars. II, *De Extrema Unctione*.<sup>21</sup> This commentary is becoming widely known and is deservedly recommended for its fullness of detail. The practice adopted in the later editions of *De Penitentia* has been again followed, namely, the addition of an *Appendix* giving some account of the law in the Oriental Churches. The overlapping which is so often observable in treatises of Canon Law and Moral Theology is quite simply met in Cappello's volumes by treating both subjects fully. M. Conte a Coronata<sup>22</sup> prefers a different method. The third book of the Code, *De Rebus*, includes the Sacraments, Cann. 731-1153. Coronata refers his readers to the Moral Theologies for this section and confines himself to *De Locis Sacris*, *De Magisterio Ecclesiastico*, *De Cultu Divino*, *De Beneficiis* and *De Bonis temporalibus*. Even so it is a large amount to include in one volume. The notes are valuable, taking account of recently discussed problems and recent decisions, and for this reason alone the Commentary is more than justified.

## II. HOLY SCRIPTURE.

BY THE REV. JOHN M. T. BARTON, D.D., Lic.S.Script.

This bulletin may well begin with two lives of Christ, which, though written from widely different standpoints, are both of them works of great distinction. The first is *La Vie de Jésus*, by M. Maurice Goguel, Directeur d'Etudes à l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes, Paris. It forms the first part of a study on *Jésus et les Origines du Christianisme*, and is a volume in the

<sup>18</sup> Paris. 5, Rue Bayard.

<sup>19</sup> Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee. 2.75 dollars.

<sup>20</sup> Vatican Press. 5 fr.

<sup>21</sup> Marietti. 307 pages 15 lire.

<sup>22</sup> *Institutiones Juris Canonici*. Vol. II. *De Rebus*, Marietti. 520 pages. 25 lire.



*Bibliothèque historique*.<sup>23</sup> M. Goguel was described, as long ago as 1911, as "un des maîtres les plus distingués de la faculté libre de théologie protestante de Paris,"<sup>24</sup> and the present volume is the fruit of many years of close study. The author has already published more than a dozen works on New Testament subjects, which cover a wide field, and, in consequence, his *Vie de Jésus* depends in great part on his earlier works. So his careful investigation of the Christian and non-Christian sources for Our Lord's life frequently makes reference to his book, published in 1925 and translated into English, entitled *Jésus de Nazareth, Mythe ou histoire?*, while his short study, in Chapter X of the present work, of the relations between John the Baptist and Christ, relies for justification of the views expressed on the volume, *Au seuil de l'Evangile. Jean-Baptiste*, issued in 1928.

After a brief but valuable chapter on the history of the various lives of Christ that have been written from the beginning to our own day, M. Goguel devotes two chapters (II and III) to the sources of the Gospel history other than the Gospels themselves. Then follow a discussion of the composition and plan of the four Gospels with some remarks on the Synoptic and Johannine problems (Chapter IV), and two further chapters on the alleged development of the Gospel tradition, and the problems and method of approach in regard of a life of Christ (Chapters V and VI). Chapter VII deals with the Gospel chronology and Chapter VIII with the duration of the public ministry. The remaining chapters (IX-XXI) are concerned with the Gospel history itself and with the form and content of Christ's teaching.

Readers of M. Goguel's earlier writings will not need to be reminded that he is decidedly radical, though he unhesitatingly rejects the "Christ Myth" school,<sup>25</sup> and has evidently taken great pains to be objective in his handling of materials. His criticism of the *formgeschichtliche Schule* with its attempted classification of the Gospel narratives into types corresponding to the different features of the life of the early Church, is trenchant and uncompromising. All this, however, cannot disguise the marked element of arbitrariness and caprice in his own efforts to discriminate between the historical and the (alleged) unhistorical narratives in the Gospel story. To take only one example of the treacherous method to which he has committed himself, he denies the apostolic character of the Fourth Gospel on three grounds: (1) that a work dating from the last decade of the first century cannot be the work of John the son of Zebedee who was martyred in A.D. 44; (2) that the theology of the Gospel represents a stage in the development of Christian

<sup>23</sup> Payot, 106, Boulevard St-Germain, Paris. 1932. pp. 536. Price 60 fr.

<sup>24</sup> *Revue Biblique*, 1911, p. 132.

<sup>25</sup> L'étude des théories mythiques montre qu'elles ne résistent pas à un examen un peu serré et qu'elles soulèvent des difficultés infiniment plus graves que celles qu'elles prétendent éviter" p. 181.



thought later than the Pauline system; (3) that the Gospel is not a work produced at one time, but a compilation of discordant elements. To say that all three propositions are highly disputable is vastly to understate the case for tradition. And a point to be noted is that the first contention (regarding St. John's alleged martyrdom in A.D. 44) rests upon evidence so late, singular and untrustworthy that M. Goguel would doubtless reject it with scorn if it favoured, instead of challenging the traditional Christian position. The book is a good example of the evasions and subterfuges to which even the best Liberal criticism has been reduced in its attempt to discredit the complete historicity of the Gospel narratives.

Père Jules Lebreton, S.J., in the preface to his recent work, *La Vie et l'Enseignement de Jésus Christ Notre Seigneur*,<sup>26</sup> is careful to distinguish it from some of its many predecessors in the same field. For apologetic arguments he refers his readers to Père de Grandmaison's *Jesus Christ*; for a study of the special characteristics of the Gospels to Père Huby's *L'Evangile et les Evangiles*; for exegesis of the texts to Père Lagrange's magnificent commentaries and to the smaller editions of the Gospels, "ces commentaires sobres mais pleins de suc," of PP. Huby, Durand, and Valensin in the same "Verbum Salutis" series to which the present volumes belong. His own book is neither a complete commentary on the Gospels nor a discussion of "Palestinian archaeology or the ethical and religious customs of the Jews" (p. 2). Rather, the aim of these conferences, addressed to an educated lay audience at the Institut Catholique of Paris, has been to give a full account of the Gospel history; to make Our Divine Lord better known and better loved; to combine history, popular interpretation and Christian devotion in one continuous narrative. I cannot hope by anything less than quotation of actual passages to convey any idea of the freshness, attractiveness and sincerity of Père Lebreton's presentation of his subject, but it has one characteristic that is most noteworthy—that, in spite of its charm and simplicity, it is a work of real learning. In Goguel's book, so different in its character and conclusions, there is a greater display of erudition, but it may be questioned whether even Goguel is better informed regarding all the latest literature in German, French and English. Nothing of any importance seems to have escaped the author's notice and page after page contains footnotes that illustrate every aspect of the subject. I have only one real regret, which I share with another reviewer, namely, that Père Lebreton has adopted and made his own the so-called "system of justice" regarding the purpose of Our Lord's parables. I agree with Père Lagrange when he writes: "Quel est le prédicateur, mécontent de son auditoire, qui prendra le parti de l'aveugler par son obscurité? S'il a jamais existé ce n'est sûrement pas le Sauveur Jésus."<sup>27</sup> It is, of

<sup>26</sup> Third edition, 1931. Two vols. pp. 469 and 525. Beauchesne, Rue de Rennes, 117, Paris. price 60 fr.

<sup>27</sup> *Revue Biblique*, April, 1932. p. 300, n. 1.

course, inevitable that certain passages should appear to some readers to fall below the general high standard; to one of them, for example, it seems that the discussion of the date of the Last Supper (Vol. II, pp. 229-236) is not very convincing. But for the work as a whole I have nothing but praise. It is, I think, the most attractive presentation of Our Lord's life and teaching that has appeared for many years.

In my bulletin for February I regretted the absence of any entirely satisfactory Catholic guide to the Holy Land. This want has now been in great part supplied by the publication of *Syrie-Palestine: Iraq-Transjordanie* in the French "Guides bleus" series.<sup>28</sup> I say "in great part," because the section dealing with Palestine proper does not bulk large in the complete work; in fact, it only occupies a little more than 100 pages. Yet within these limits a great deal of accurate, up-to-date information is given regarding all the chief sites and sanctuaries of Palestine and the writer is perhaps the most experienced cicerone of his or any other time, Père François Marie Abel, O.P., of the Ecole biblique de St. Etienne. He is also responsible for the *Aperçu Général* of over 50 pages, which provides a wealth of information on the Holy Land and the surrounding countries, grouped under the four-fold heading: "Le cadre physique; les hommes et l'activité humaine; aperçu historique; aperçu religieux, artistique et littéraire." This is, undoubtedly, the most trustworthy of all guides, as well as the most recent. No doubt, like the other *Guides bleus*, it will be translated into English.

For full, technical reviews of Professor John Garstang's latest publication, *The Foundations of Bible History, Joshua: Judges*,<sup>29</sup> I may refer my readers to the *Revue biblique*, January, 1932, pp. 129-32, and to Professor Stanley Cook's lengthy criticism in the *Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund*, April, 1932, pp. 88-96. For non-specialists, who are not specially interested in Dr. Garstang's attempt to identify the Exodus with the reign of Thotmes III (1447 B.C.) and to place the entry of Israel into Canaan in the time of Amenophis III (i.e., circa 1407 B.C.), the chief interest of the book will lie in its value as a guide to the topography of ancient Palestine and to recent archaeological enterprise. The illustrations include seventy-three plates, many of them with two photographs to the page, in addition to numerous drawings and maps. Those who are lucky enough to possess or borrow this fine book will agree with Professor Cook that: "Regarded as a whole, the volume is original in conception, conscientious in its workmanship and as fascinating for its illustrations as it is invaluable for deeper study of the subject."<sup>30</sup>

<sup>28</sup> Hachette: 1932. pp. cxi.; 677, with 13 transparent maps and 55 plans, Price, 75 fr.

<sup>29</sup> Constable, London, 1931. pp. xxiv. and 423. Price, £1.

<sup>30</sup> Art. cit., p. 89.

Père Vosté's work on the Parables was reviewed with great praise in my last bulletin. Since then I have received two further books, a second edition of his well-known *Commentarius in Epistolam ad Ephesios*,<sup>31</sup> which may well rank as the best and clearest commentary on Ephesians in any language; and a more recent work on *De Divina Inspiratione et Veritate Sacrae Scripturae*,<sup>32</sup> which contains the substance of two earlier *opuscula* with considerable additions. In its present form the treatise on Inspiration covers the whole ground and is a suitable book for use in seminaries. Perhaps the most valuable section is No. VI: "De Scripturarum veritate seu inerrantia." A well annotated series of documents forms an appendix of some thirty pages, and there are three indices, which should make reference to any particular point extremely easy.<sup>33</sup>

Among German books received I may mention the commentary on the second part of Isaiah by Professor Paul Volz in Sellin's *Kommentar zum Alten Testament*.<sup>34</sup> The first volume was edited in 1930 by Professor Otto Procksch. As is well-known, Professor Sellin's series of commentaries is in tendency rather less radical than those formerly edited by Nowack and Marti. Here, among other things, the question of the "Servant" passages in Isaiah is fully and fairly discussed. The tables on pp. 167 and 188 are especially useful as concise summaries of the various opinions that have been held regarding this problem and as showing how critical opinion has, with some exceptions, deserted the collective interpretation of the passages. Professor Volz himself interprets Is. lii. 13—liii. 12, in an eschatological sense (p. 189 f.).

I may also notice the second volume of Sellin's own work, *Geschichte des Israelitisch-Jüdischen Volkes*,<sup>35</sup> which carries the history of Israel from the time of the Babylonian exile down to Alexander the Great. Throughout the work Professor Sellin admits his indebtedness to Kittel's great *Geschichte*; his own book is much shorter but is remarkably useful and suggestive. It is of interest to learn that Sellin does not adopt Van Hoonacker's proposed reversal in chronological order of Esdras and Nehemias.

Two short popular works have recently been added to the smaller series of *Etudes bibliques*. Père Lavergne's concise summary of Lagrange's large commentary on St. Luke<sup>36</sup> will be welcomed in a series that already includes the abridged editions of Lagrange's *Saint Marc* and of Calmes' *Saint Jean*. In one respect, the commentary resembles our Westminster series, since

<sup>31</sup> Romae: Libreria del "Collegio Angelico," Via S. Vitale, 15. pp. 352.

<sup>32</sup> Same publisher. Ed. 2a, 1932. pp. 208.

<sup>33</sup> In neither case is the price stated. *Verb. sap!*

<sup>34</sup> Verlagsbuchhandlung D. Werner Scholl, Leipzig. 1932. Jesaja II übersetzt und erklärt von D. Paul Volz. pp. xxxviii and 310. Price of Isaiah I and II, bound, 39 marks.

<sup>35</sup> Quelle und Meyer, Leipzig. 1932. pp. 197. Price, bound, 7.80 marks.

<sup>36</sup> Gabalda. 1932. pp. 280. Price, 20 fr.

no word is quoted in Greek or Semitic characters. It has this advantage over the larger work, published in 1921, that it makes reference to any books or articles written by Lagrange in the interval. M. J. Chaine's *Introduction à la Lecture des Prophètes*<sup>37</sup> is not, the author informs us, an introduction to the study of the prophets, since it supposes that questions of text and authenticity have already been treated; nor is it a commentary, a doctrinal work, or a piece of apologetic. It is simply an introduction to the prophets that may help priests and seminarists to read the prophetic oracles in their chronological setting. It should be added that the biblical text is not printed; it is assumed that the reader will have a copy of the Bible at hand. The plan is excellent and the book should certainly be translated into English. It might with great profit be combined with a cautiously amended text and a few notes to form a Catholic counterpart to Woods and Powell: *The Hebrew Prophets for English Readers*.<sup>38</sup>

Limits of space do not ordinarily allow of my mentioning periodical literature in detail, but a word of welcome must be offered to the first number of *Orientalia*.<sup>39</sup> It is important that the purpose of the new periodical should be noted, namely, to deal with all questions relating to the ancient East "*exclusis quaestionibus, quae directe tangunt res biblicas, quippe quae in periodico 'Biblica' tractentur.*" The first number contains, among other articles, a discussion of Barhebraeus's doctrine of the rational soul by G. Furlani; some remarks by P. Maurus Witzel, O.F.M., on Ishtar's Descent into Hell; and a collection of Sabaeen inscriptions by Professors Mordtmann and Mittwoch. The printing of the journal is particularly good and no less than six founts of Oriental type have been laid under contribution. The Pontifical Biblical Institute is to be congratulated on its enterprise in producing a magazine which, in the nature of things, makes appeal to a very limited public.

### III. CHURCH HISTORY.

BY H. OUTRAM EVENNETT, M.A.

The seventh volume of the *Cambridge Mediaeval History*, recently published, deals with the fourteenth century. The introduction is by Dr. Previt -Orton, and the general arrangement and division of chapters are similar to those of earlier volumes. Of the chapters dealing specifically with ecclesiastical history, Professor Mollat's on the Avignon Papacy and the Great Schism

<sup>37</sup> Gabalda. 1932. pp. 274, with 10 pages of plates and 3 plans. Price, 20 fr.

<sup>38</sup> Four Vols. Clarendon Press. 1909-12.

<sup>39</sup> Pp. 94. Published by the Pontifical Biblical Institute, Piazza Pilotta, 35, Rome, at the rate of 3 fascicles a year. Subscription price, outside Italy, 100 lire.

follows  
is comp  
two ve  
Middle  
and M

Amo  
of Bre  
therefo  
the tw  
Mr. G  
patriot  
writer  
the R  
histori  
moral  
than  
connec  
howev  
he let  
occup  
as he  
is sig  
himse  
until  
positi  
be sh  
ment  
so im  
spite  
rest  
appe  
show

Th  
Abel  
total  
and  
of h  
men

M  
tutic  
Scu  
Kni  
and  
of t  
not  
buil  
her

40

41

42

follows closely his larger works on these subjects, while Wyclif is competently dealt with by Mr. Bernard Manning. There are two very able and interesting summaries of "The Jews in the Middle Ages" and "Mediaeval Mysticism" by Mr. Cecil Roth and Miss Evelyn Underhill respectively.

Among other mediaeval works Mr. G. W. Greenaway's *Arnold of Brescia*<sup>40</sup> is the first account of its subject in English and is, therefore, likely to be turned to by all who are interested in the twelfth century. It is a competent and scholarly book, and Mr. Greenaway shows clearly that Arnold's reputation as a patriot-politician rests rather upon the works of certain Italian writers of the later nineteenth century who were obsessed with the Roman Question, than upon the findings of disinterested historians. Arnold is here presented as first and foremost a moral and religious teacher, whose political ideas were no more than the working out of his moral principles, and whose connection with the Roman Republic was accidental. It is clear, however, that we really know very little indeed about Arnold; he left neither books nor letters, nor does he seem to have occupied so prominent a place in the minds of his contemporaries as he has since succeeded in filling in text-books. Indeed, it is significant that in a biography of some 200 pages Arnold himself does not begin to figure prominently, let alone dominate, until the chapter beginning on page 111. His radical moral position, moreover, was neither isolated nor original and cannot be shown to have had any direct influence on the later development of ideas. It is difficult, therefore, to believe that he was so important or significant a personage as Mr. Greenaway—in spite of all these admissions—would yet have us believe. For the rest Mr. Greenaway is rather at sea when theology or mysticism appear—as witness his remarks on Hugh of St. Victor—and he shows a tendency to be harsh towards St. Bernard.

The problems in regard to a much more important person—Abelard—whose follower in some respects Arnold was, are of a totally different order. Much has been written about Abelard, and now Mr. J. G. Sikes has produced a new English study of him. As I have not read this I can do no more than merely mention it and add that it has received favourable reviews.<sup>41</sup>

Miss Helena Chew is known to students of English Constitutional History as the authority on that very difficult subject Scutage. In her *English Ecclesiastical Tenants-in-Chief and Knight Service*<sup>42</sup> she has dealt fully with the position of bishops and abbeys in regard to their military obligations for lands held of the King by Knight-Service. The book is technical and will not appeal to the general reader, but it has its importance in building up our knowledge of how the mediaeval Church fitted herself into the social and military conditions of the central

<sup>40</sup> Cambridge University Press.

<sup>41</sup> *Peter Abailard*. Cambridge University Press.

<sup>42</sup> Oxford University Press.



portion of the Middle Ages. In her last chapter Miss Chew makes a useful, if hardly conclusive, contribution towards the vexed problem of what precisely was meant by "Barony."

The interest, on the other hand, of Professor Stenton's *English Feudalism 1066-1166*<sup>43</sup> is more general. It is a book that ought not to be missed by anyone who wishes to understand what England was like in the hundred years after the Norman Conquest. It is written with a literary capacity and ease only too infrequently attained by those who have to concern themselves with the complicated technicalities of feudal society. Besides shedding new light on many points of interest mainly to specialists, it will help the general reader to form some notion of feudal conditions of life, and convincingly maintains the point of view that in all the period dealt with, and even during the so-called "anarchy" of Stephen's reign, the real interests of King and Baronage were, and at the time were consciously realized to be, more or less identical. Of course, it is not Church History, but no period of Church History can rightly be understood without an understanding of the general conditions of society at the time, and as Mr. Z. N. Brooke has recently reminded us in his *English Church and the Papacy from William I to John* (mentioned in these notes for February 1932), the reign of Stephen was of very great importance in English Church History. Indeed, the chronological limits of Professor Stenton and Mr. Brooke's books are nearly the same. Among smaller books Professor Powicke's *Medieval England* in the Home University Library series can be recommended unreservedly as a series of stimulating essays on selected aspects of Medieval England. Catholics will find his section on the Church interesting, if in a certain sense provocative. Mr. Turberville's *Spanish Inquisition* in the same series is sober, competent and well-informed, and ably compresses all the main facts and points of the subject within a very manageable area.

Turning to the sixteenth century, the *Revolt of the Netherlands*<sup>44</sup> of Professor Geyl, Professor of Dutch History and Institutions in the University of London, is a very valuable and timely book, in spite of being avowedly a condensation of a larger Dutch work by the same author and of lacking all external signs of the apparatus of erudition that has obviously gone to its composition. In three hundred very readable pages, in which the hand of a foreigner is seldom if ever revealed, it covers the period 1555-1609. The author is a patriotic Dutchman who laments the failure of the whole group of provinces to free themselves from the rule of Philip II and so achieve a united Netherlands nation from Groningen to Dunkirk and from the Hague to Luxembourg. In opposition to most English writers and to such Belgian historians as M. Pirenne, he maintains very strongly that there was no pre-existing natural division between the two groups of provinces

<sup>43</sup> Oxford University Press.

<sup>44</sup> Williams & Norgate.



that eventually separated into The United Provinces (Holland) and the Spanish Netherlands. The eventual line of division, he points out, was not linguistic; neither was it racial. Still less was it originally religious—though it was afterwards made so by state action on both sides of it. The first home and propagandist centre of Calvinism was not Holland and Zeeland but Flanders and Brabant, from which it was only extirpated by violence and persecution. Conversely Catholicism remained the religion of the majority in Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht and especially Groningen until well after 1581, and was only stamped out slowly by an active and erastian Calvinist minority, many of them Flemish and Brabant exiles, using a policy of violence and bad faith, the success of which was due solely to the stress of war-conditions and to the ease of identifying, often quite falsely, Catholicism with pro-Spanish sympathy. Indeed, Professor Geyl shows convincingly that there was originally more cultural and political sympathy between Holland, Zeeland and Utrecht on the one hand, and Flanders and Brabant on the other, than there was between either of these two groups and the newer north-eastern provinces consolidated by Charles V. What really determined the boundary between those territories that vindicated their independence and those that remained subject to Spain was the course of warfare, as this was determined by geography—the position of the great rivers—and by political accidents such as Parma's enforced and reluctant interferences in France and in the affair of the Armada. North of the great rivers the Spaniards could not prevail, nor could Parma prevent Prince Maurice from forcibly subjugating the provinces east of the Zuyder Zee which until quite a late date had seemed likely to remain Catholic and Spanish. South of the rivers, where sea power counted for less, the Spaniards were irresistible. The final allocation of territories was thus due to military forces rather than to inherent pre-existing natural divisions. The religious division followed and, indeed, was imposed by the political division after this latter had been determined by the fortunes of war. It is true that scholars and those who follow the main movements of the world of scholarship have, for the most part, long since abandoned the crudities of Motley's views, for whom the whole revolt was not—as it is for Professor Geyl—a national uprising complicated and largely spoiled by religious differences, but a revolt fundamentally religious in origin and purpose; yet it is less certain whether this has been realized by what there is of an intelligent general reading public, among whom views on the Revolt of the Netherlands derive ultimately from Motley. For such, Professor Geyl, who writes in an admirably fair and impartial tone, will have done a great service.

In these notes for November 1931, I mentioned Volume XII of the Görresgesellschaft's *Concilium Tridentinum* collection. A further volume, Volume III: *Diariorum Pars Tertia, Volumen prius*, has since appeared, edited by the veteran scholar, Mgr. Sebastian Merkle, who produced the first volume of the whole

series in 1901. The contents of this new volume all have reference to the third group of sessions of the Council. The most important piece is the *Acta Concilii Tridentini*, compiled on the basis of his diary kept during the Council by the very able Bolognese canonist, Gabriel Paleotto, who was auditor of the Rota and as legal advisor to the papal legates, a person of great influence. Mgr. Merkle has postponed both Index and Prolegomena until the next volume (*Diariorum Pars Tertia, volumen alterum*), which he promises within two years, and meanwhile anyone who wishes properly to understand his edition of Paleotto (which will now supersede the earlier ones of Mendham and Theiner) will have to fall back upon his article *Kardinal Paleotto's Litterarischer Nachlass* which appeared in the *Römische Quartalschrift* in 1897. Paleotto is one of the most important of sources for the third group of sessions at Trent. The remainder of the volume is taken up by the Diary of Astolfo Servantio, one of the assistants to the secretary, Bishop Massarelli; some "relationes" sent by the Bishop of Ischia during the critical months, December 1562 and January 1563, to Cardinal Morone, the future saviour of the Council; and, lastly, a group of interesting pieces from the pen of Filippo Musotti, secretary first to Cardinal Seripando and, after his death, to the Cardinal of Lorraine. Of all these only the "relationes" of the Bishop of Ischia are entirely new.<sup>45</sup>

It may be useful to mention that Troeltsch's *Soziallehren der Christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen* is now available in an English translation.<sup>46</sup> Of other standard works two further volumes of M. Bremond's *Histoire du sentiment religieux en France*, called *La vie chrétienne sous l'ancien régime* and *La prière de l'ancien régime*, have recently appeared, while the last (eighteenth) volume of the late Monsignor Mann's *Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages*, which goes from Boniface VIII to Benedict XI, is now available. Finally, among manuals of church history, which have their use both for the specialist scholar and for the general reader, two very useful and competent examples are the *Histoire de l'Eglise*<sup>47</sup> of Dom C. Poulet, of the abbey of St. Paul-de-Wisques (Solesmes congregation), which is written much on the lines of the well-known *Précis d'Histoire de l'Eglise* of Mourret and Carreyre, but is shorter and more synthetic; and, secondly, the *Contemporary Church History: 1900-1925* of the Italian Barnabite, Father Premoli, the English translation of which is published by Burns, Oates & Washbourne for 10s. 6d.

<sup>45</sup> A more detailed review of this volume will appear in the *Downside Review* for October, 1932.

<sup>46</sup> *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*. 2 vols. George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.

<sup>47</sup> 2 vols. Gabriel Beauchesne. Paris. 4th edition.

## MORAL CASES

### DEAF-MUTES AND CONFESSION.

Is a deaf-mute strictly bound to confess his sins by signs or writing in order to secure the material integrity of his confession?

#### REPLY.

The position of deaf-mutes as discussed by the older authors (e.g., St. Alphonsus, Lib. VI, n. 479) needs some modification in these days, when enormous progress has been made in teaching even deaf-mutes from birth to communicate their thoughts.

(1) It may be answered, firstly, that an integral confession, by writing or by other means, is *usually to be urged* for the advantage of the penitents themselves. That is to say, the law requiring integrity of a confession always binds in the sense that the confession must be made at some future time, when the reasons excusing one at the moment no longer hold. In making a confession by means of writing or signs, all anxiety about future obligations is removed, and the penitent is enabled to receive the Sacrament more fruitfully. (2) Secondly, it is not established with certainty that there is an obligation to confess by writing, if an integral confession cannot otherwise be secured. Numbers of authors, ancient and modern, hold the view that the penitent is bound to write down his sins, provided the danger of breaking the seal is removed, and various methods are suggested for removing it. St. Alphonsus says that this view is "probabilior et communior." But the milder view is also defended by many others and it is, at least, solidly probable. The reason is put by Génicot as follows: "scripturam ad confitendum esse medium extraordinarium et quod minus cohaereat cum jure penitentis ad secretam confessionem. Nam scriptura est de se perpetua, ideoque ob casum quemdam, puta morbum confessarii, in cuiuslibet manus venire potest. Neque apparet cur ad scribendum adigatur mutus dum omnes ab hoc medio adhibendo excusant eum qui, ob labilem memoriam, peccata aliter recordari non possit" (*Theologia Moralis*, II, §282). The stress should be placed not on the act of writing which, after all, is not so extraordinary a way of conveying our thoughts to others, but on the danger of public revelation of the sins enumerated, however remote this danger may be. The view that such persons are bound to write their confession is defended by Fr. S. Klopfer, whose opinion is worthy of the highest consideration, since he has been for many years a chaplain at a large Institute for deaf-mutes in America (*American Ecclesiastical Review*, Vol. LVII, 1917, p. 79). I should like also to record the experience of Fr. Charles Jones, a deaf priest who was for many years in charge of the deaf and dumb in London, and earned the admiration of all by his self-sacrificing life. "The

deaf and dumb are accustomed to write their confessions, and give them to the priest, who asks by writing what is necessary, or points to the necessary questions in some of the forms of examination of conscience; then gives them to read some short *ferverino* to excite sorrow, with the Act of Contrition to recite before absolution. This little extra care will not be time wasted; it will ensure a more fruitful reception of the Sacrament of Penance on the part of the deaf and dumb penitent who really needs this extra care" (A Circular recommended by His Eminence Cardinal Bourne, December 7th, 1919). In giving a probable solution of a question which is not certain, it is always preferable to rely on the opinion of a person skilled and experienced in the matter under discussion, rather than upon the speculative opinions of authors. It is the Aristotelian-Thomistic notion of "probable" which has gone rather out of favour in these days. Nevertheless, whilst insisting on the advisability and usefulness of writing, in the case of deaf-mutes, and whilst urging the practice as strongly as possible, it cannot be said to be a certain obligation. (3) Lastly, if the deaf-mute is trained to communicate his thoughts by signs which the confessor can understand, he is bound to confess his sins in this manner. "In actu sacramenti," writes St. Thomas, "ad manifestationem ordinarie assumitur ille actus quo maxime consuevimus manifestare scilicet, proprium verbum; alii enim modi sunt inducti in supplementum ipisus . . . et ideo quando non possumus uno modo, debemus secundum quod possumus, confiteri" (*Summa Theologica*, III, Q. 9, art. 4). St. Thomas's argument supports the view that the penitent is bound to confess by writing. We have seen, that, in the opinion of a number of theologians, writing cannot be insisted upon because of the possible danger of public revelation of sin. But the text is quoted here because of the phrase "ordinarie assumitur ille actus, quo maxime consuevimus manifestare." To the uninitiated it is quite baffling to witness the ease with which trained deaf-mutes can communicate with others by lip-reading, as well as by the old manual alphabet. The point is that, for such people, this method of communication is that which they normally and ordinarily employ in every day use. The teaching of the authors who excuse deaf-mutes from the obligation of writing a confession is always given on the assumption that they cannot explain themselves by signs, either because they are unskilled or because the confessor does not understand the system.

E. J. M.

## ROMAN DOCUMENTS

BY THE REV. A. BENTLEY, Ph.D., M.A.

### LITURGICAL REFORMS IN THE ETERNAL CITY.

Liturgical reforms for the city of Rome have a double interest. They frequently foreshadow universal legislation of like character; and, what is of more immediate consequence, they are usually an attempt to give practical effect to the letter and the spirit of existing law. Thus the main purpose of the recent regulations concerning electric light was to call attention to, and to enforce, certain *general* decrees, interpreting and expanding them.

A further Notification by the Cardinal Vicar, prompted by the Apostolic Visitation of the City of Rome, embraces four principal points—the custody of the Blessed Sacrament, votive candles, artificial flowers and flash-light photography in the Churches of the Eternal City. The official Italian text appeared in the *Osservatore Romano* for June 23rd. The following translation will show in what direction Cardinal Marchetti-Selvaggiani is restraining abuses which appeared to be permanently entrenched.

“Dignity of worship and the fit adornment of sacred temples, one of the principal objects of the Apostolic Visitation promulgated for the diocese of Rome, demand the abolition of certain abuses which have been gradually introduced, and a return to the full observance of canonical and liturgical laws.

“With such end in view, therefore, we make the following dispositions :

“(i) Attention must be given to the exact observance of can. 1268, *seq.*, of the Code of Canon Law, concerning the custody and *cultus* of the Most Holy Eucharist. The altar at which the Blessed Sacrament is reserved should be the High Altar or one of the principal altars in the church; this altar must be cared for in a very special way, both as regards cleanliness, the prime adornment of sacred temples, and as regards furnishings, which should be the best that each church possesses. Particular care should be taken to see that at least one oil lamp or beeswax candle burn continually, day and night, before the tabernacle. Before the same altar, benches or chairs of a sufficient number should be placed, so that the faithful may be drawn to pray before the Blessed Sacrament, and that they may not be disturbed by any unnecessary walking about and idle talk.

“(ii) Various grave inconveniences are caused by the custom, prevailing in many churches, of placing at the disposal of the faithful, in consideration of corresponding offerings, small wax candles known as votive candles, to be burnt upon candlesticks or stands of the most varied and bizarre shapes, before statues



or sacred pictures (of which many, however, have been, or should have been, removed as a result of the Visitation). It may, in fact, easily become or appear to be a superstition, and it fosters the impression that it is done for the purpose of gain; nor does it contribute to the cleanliness and quiet of sacred temples, in which a simultaneous burning of many candles, frequently not beeswax, stains the floor, discolours the walls with smoke and vitiates the air.

“ This practice must therefore cease.

“ Hence the candlesticks or stands mentioned above, even if they are of some material or artistic worth, should be removed from all churches and public or semi-public oratories, and also from adjoining or dependent buildings. It is likewise strictly forbidden to sell wax candles in churches or oratories, in sacristies, at the entrance to churches or oratories, or indeed in places that are adjacent or in any way controlled by the clergy or religious who have charge of a church.

“ The clergy and religious will explain to the faithful the motives for such a prohibition on the part of ecclesiastical Authority, and will urge the faithful to flock in greater numbers, and as frequently as possible, to hear Holy Mass and approach Holy Communion, reminding them that a single Mass well heard, or a single Holy Communion received with right dispositions, has greater power to obtain heavenly graces and favours than thousands of candles lit even for the longest series of days. Let the faithful, moreover, be encouraged, following very ancient and laudable traditions, to give alms for Mass to be celebrated, and to offer candles of beeswax (in accordance with liturgical prescriptions), candles which they themselves will buy elsewhere, and which, left in the sacristy, will be used for burning on the altars during liturgical functions.

“ (iii) Artificial flowers (of whatever material: cloth, bronze, brass, earthenware) are forbidden. They must be removed at once from churches and oratories and from altars, nor may they be placed there for any reason whatsoever. For the decoration of churches or altars, a sober display of fresh flowers and plants, such as abound in this country throughout the year, may be resorted to, and the faithful may be encouraged to offer them to the church.

“ (iv) During sacred functions (as, indeed, at weddings, First Communions, etc.) it is absolutely forbidden, in churches and oratories alike, to take photographs with magnesian light, whether with cinema apparatus or by exposure.

\* \* \*

“ We enjoin upon Rectors and Superiors of churches and of public or semi-public oratories to ensure the strict observance of the above dispositions, all of which, *and especially those numbered 2, 3, 4, will come into force with the 1st of July, prox.*

“ We are convinced that the aforesaid Rectors and Superiors



will willingly co-operate with us in the interests of the beauty of God's house and of the integrity of the Faith, at the same time giving thereby a conspicuous example of submission to the commands of ecclesiastical Authority. If any unfortunately should not obey the above prescriptions, measures will be taken against them with all the rigour of the law, not excluding, over and above canonical sanctions, proportionate pecuniary penalties."

## BOOK REVIEWS

*The Words of the Missal*, by the Rev. C. C. Martindale, S.J.  
(Sheed & Ward. pp. 224. 6s.)

The Sacred Liturgy is the Church's official system of the worship of God, and is for the individual soul the primary source of the true Christian spirit. Its centre is the Mass and so the understanding of the Mass, of the prayers and ceremonies that constitute its rite, is of paramount importance for every Catholic who desires to worship God according to the mind of the Church and to widen and deepen his own spiritual life on the most solid foundation. The Missal is a difficult book not merely because it is written in a strange tongue, but much more because of the wealth of meaning that has become crystallised in all the chief words of its texts. Hence a book explaining these words is absolutely necessary for anyone who wishes to understand and appreciate and use fruitfully the prayers of the Church.

Such a book has just come from the brilliant pen of Father Martindale. It is a most fascinating book, delightfully written, erudite yet simple in every page, a manifestation of deep scholarship as it is an acute analysis of true devotion. The object of the book is to extract the essential meaning of some of the words of the Missal (p. 62)—it is a book about *words*, and therefore about ideas, which are scattered up and down the Missal and, therefore, in some way characteristic of it (pp. 153, 158). If we do not attend to the words, if we do not really understand them, we miss an immense amount of the meaning of the prayers and, therefore, of the Church's mind and spirit. Words in a book like the Missal—enshrining the Catholic thought of centuries—have a depth of meaning which at first sight is quite unsuspected, they have a "colour," a "taste," a "personality" which can be appreciated only by patient and thoughtful study.

Father Martindale selects from the Missal the leading ideas and makes the words in which these ideas are expressed the subject of his study. Thus he has chapters on "Joy and Gladness," "Sadness and Consolation," "Human Fragility," "The Divine Initiative," "God's Hand or Power," "God's Largesse," "Man's Transformation," "The Light of Life," "Charity, Unity, Peace." He is a master of the art of translation—direct, clear and simple in style, vivid and colourful in expression—and places before us the content of the Missal in a way that grips us and compels interest and attention. He clothes the dead bones of the words of the prayers with the living flesh of the thought that lies beneath.

This book is a guide not only to the literal—especially to the fundamental—meaning of the chief words of the Missal, but also, and more particularly, to their dogmatic and spiritual content. Enshrined in the Missal's prayers is a wonderful synopsis of Catholic teaching—the Church's belief concerning faith, good works, grace, merit, reconciliation, and so forth. Father Martindale brings out this teaching and drives it home by his clever commentary. Furthermore the words of the Missal epitomize the principles of the spiritual life and describe the Catholic idea of the relations between God and the individual soul. From this point of view Father Martindale shows us that the Missal is truly a book of deep consolation. The main idea that one gathers from the prayers which he analyzes is *encouragement* springing from what these prayers tell us of the unlimited bounty and lavish generosity of God, of the joy that He wishes for His servants here and hereafter, of our strength and hope in Christ—the head of the mystical body of which we are the members—of divine providence, divine mercy, divine pity.

Father Martindale's pages are penetrated through and through with the real spirit of the Sacred Liturgy, for example he frequently stresses the necessity of the *active* participation of the people in the official worship which is given to God by His Church. His treatment of the symbolism of certain parts of the Liturgy, *e.g.*, the hallowing of the baptismal water on Holy Saturday, is particularly helpful. In the course of his examination of the words of the Missal he quotes in illustration an incredible number of the prayers—what a pity that he did not give us an ordered list of them at the end of the book (such a list would have been as easy for him to compile as it will be difficult for his readers), and why—oh! why—did he not add an alphabetical index? Such a very valuable book should not be without an index.

Having got much from Father Martindale, we want more. May we hope that he will give us soon a translation of the *entire* Missal (how invaluable a translation from his pen would be in these days when every effort should be made to get the layman to use, to understand, and to love his Missal) or at least of the entire Ordinary of the Mass? The author of *The Words of the Missal* seems to think that it will not be a popular book; we shall be much surprised if it will not be a liturgical "best seller." The Mass means very little for too many of the household of the faith, the Missal is for too many an unknown, an unappreciated book. Father Martindale wrote that we all may really understand and, therefore, love better the Missal and the Mass. His book should be read and re-read by every intelligent Catholic, it is in very truth a treasure and a joy. If it be read with the attention that every page merits the Missal will become for us a living thing charged with spiritual energy, overflowing with the waters of consolation and of hope.

*Conception Island or the Troubled Story of the Catholic Church in Grenada, B.W.I.*, by Raymund Devas, O.P., M.C. (Sands & Co. pp. 436.)

Too much praise can never be given to those who save from destruction the records of local history. It is a task which calls for much industry and much patience. In the present instance, for example, Fr. Devas has had to hunt out sources in places as far apart as Boston, Rome and London to supplement the records he found in Grenada. His care has been well rewarded. Its fruit is this exceedingly interesting, well-documented, well-indexed volume.

Some of his story will have value for Grenadians alone—inevitably—but much more of it than might be guessed has a wide and lasting interest for all Catholic subjects of the Empire. It is the story of the rise and fall of Protestant Ascendancy in a tiny dependency—and that in modern times; the story of a church betrayed and tried, surviving marvellously to flourish in the end as never before.

Columbus himself was Grenada's discoverer and to him it owes its original name commemorating Our Lady's Immaculate Conception. But though discovered so early no settlement was made for another hundred and fifty years when an expedition from Martinique took possession of it for Louis XIV. In French hands it remained until 1763, Dominicans first of all and then Capuchins ministering to its spiritual needs.

By the Peace of Paris (1763) it passed to the English, was recaptured by the French in the next war (1779) and again made over to England in 1783. With the second English conquest begins the story of the Church's trial.

The population at the time was, of course, almost entirely Catholic, and the treaties had guaranteed to the Catholics full liberty to practise their religion and the preservation of all their civil rights. Steadily through the next twenty years the new Protestant rulers, in defiance of the treaties, deprived the churches of their endowments (confiscated for the benefit of the Anglicans) and ousted the Catholics from the Legislature. It was made illegal for Catholics to be married by their own clergy and the practice was introduced whereby the clergy required the Governor's licence to officiate.

The island was, ecclesiastically, under the jurisdiction of the London Vicar-Apostolic until 1819—an awkward arrangement which tried the patience and ingenuity of more than one English bishop. In that year a separate Vicariate for the West Indies was, however, established.

The Catholics of Grenada fought as best they could the aggression of their new rulers, their priests—seculars since 1795 and most of them Irishmen—leading them manfully. To add to their troubles the opposition of one of the priests to this anti-Catholic rule developed into a schism which lasted nine years.

Catholics regained their civil rights in 1832, the schism ended in 1838, and the restrictions on marriages were removed in 1842. The history since then is one of steady development, always under great handicaps, and especially in the matter of schools—a task whose difficulty is evident when one remembers how great a proportion of the Catholics are the poor coloured descendants of the slaves.

The Legislature from time to time was coaxed and coerced into making grants of money—the Secretary of State in London being more than once, in this respect, on the side of justice. But no restitution of the illegally confiscated Catholic endowments has ever been made, nor do all the grants made by the Legislature in a century or more come anywhere near the value of what was stolen. Fr. Devas, in an appendix, gives the balance sheet of this account.

Since 1901 the island has been in the care of the English Dominicans. In congratulating them on the history which their Vicar-Provincial has produced, may we express the hope that their labours may one day be lightened by the long due restoration of the valuable Catholic endowments?

PHILIP HUGHES.

*What are Saints?* by C. C. Martindale, S.J. (Sheed & Ward. 1s.; in cloth, 2s. 6d.)

Fr. Martindale's broadcast talks on the Saints were so widely appreciated that it would have been a calamity to let them perish in the air. It would be hard to find better value for a shilling than you have in these 160 pages packed tight with interest. The very nature of the original talks imposed an economy of language which might have cramped the style of anybody but Fr. Martindale; but he is always on top of his material, and as phrase follows flashing phrase to illuminate the biographies the saints stand out clear and emphatic in their personalities. You can't forget them. There is not a figure in the book that does not fire the reader's imagination as first it has fired the writer's. "Whenever you read a biography you do much more than obtain a knowledge of mere facts. You pick up a 'taste,' an aroma, an impression of the man in question; if you do not, the biography is no good." Judged by his own test, Fr. Martindale's work passes triumphantly. Moreover, every one of these saints is shown to have a perpetual appeal and to have in his character or in his work a "value" for our own time.

You cannot make a mistake in buying this book. There is literally not a dull page between its covers. And when you have read it you will look forward to the realization of its author's expressed hope to broadcast a series of women saints after a due interval.

T. E. F.

## REVIEW OF REVIEWS

The DUBLIN REVIEW for July opens with two further articles in the symposium on the "Values of Contemporary Apologetics." Dr. Edwyn Bevan in a valuable and sympathetic article explains the "chief causes" which, in his judgment, are "limiting the success of Roman efforts to propagate the faith." Relatively little is said about doctrinal and historical difficulties against acceptance of the Church's claims; the article is chiefly devoted to a discussion of such "existing modes of devotion and worship" as deter men from entering the Church. The Abbot of Downside among many other good things stresses the international character of Catholic scholarship. "No one can say 'You are a fool to become a Catholic' to one who in joining the Catholic Church is embracing unanimity, tradition, history, learning, logic in the place of uncertainty and division, novelties and fallacies, bad history and unreason" (p. 23). Sir Charles Petrie, whose excellent study of *The Jacobite Movement* was recently published, gives a lucid account of the events leading up to the exile of another Royal house in "The Spanish Revolution." His study of Alfonso's character is judicious and he emphasizes the lack of generosity shown by the Second Republic in regard of the royal property and the religious. The article on "The Eucharistic Congress in Dublin" by Lord Clonmore is mainly occupied with a summary of the evidence for Catholic belief in the Real Presence throughout the ages. Mgr. Hallett's "Blessed Thomas More as an English prose writer" quotes with approval M. Delcourt's opinion that More was in a sense the founder of modern English literature. An interesting point is raised by the observation that: "Often, when he is writing in English, he seems to be thinking in Latin" and a sentence from More's English works is put into Latin with hardly a change in the order of the words.

The MONTH for July has an able discussion by the Editor, entitled "Cæsarism, Conscience and War," of the rights of individuals to refuse their co-operation in warfare and "to exact from their rulers the thorough implementing of this (Kellogg) Pact to which they have agreed. . . ." (p. 30). He writes that "our treatises of moral theology, when dealing with this question must, I think, henceforth take explicit cognizance both of the Kellogg Pact and of the World Court of International Justice and declare that, in view of the existence of these new entities, it is at least probable that one of the conditions of a just war, viz., the impossibility of finding other means of redress, is now definitely ruled out" (p. 35). Fr. Keating justly concludes that: "If the Disarmament Conference does not succeed, that failure will be a sign that the various Governments are not sincere in their purpose to abolish war or are too weak to accomplish it" (p. 39).

Mgr. d'Herbigny writes in *ETUDES* for June 20th on the Panislamic Congresses of 1926 (Mecca) and 1931 (Jerusalem).



He points to the fact that, in spite of much intriguing, together with a marked infiltration of materialism into Islamic circles, true monotheism still claims a large proportion of adherents among Arabic-speaking peoples. Unfortunately belief in divine providence and the moral law is menaced by the Bolshevik propaganda, which has penetrated even to Mecca itself. An article in *LE CORRESPONDANT* for June 10th, by Roger Labonne, on the Thirteenth Centenary of Islam gives a clear account of the principal tenets of Islam, of the dispute regarding the Khalifate, and of Moslem psychology. In the same number, Dom J. B. Monnoyeur continues his vindication of Huysmans against his critics, who have endeavoured to prove that the author of *En Route* was not a sincere convert to the Faith. The author has been able to make use of about a hundred private letters, never intended for publication, which amply demonstrate the strength and sincerity of Huysmans' Catholicism.

Under the heading *Philosophes catholiques contemporains*, Edg. de Bruyne, writing in *LA CITE CHRETIENNE*, discusses the work of Dr. Dietrich von Hildebrand, Professor at the University of Munich. He recommends in particular a study of the Professor's great work *Metaphysik der Gemeinschaft*, published at Augsburg in 1930, as the first volume of the series *Kirche und Gesellschaft*. The article is of profound interest to all who wish to know something of the teaching of scholastic philosophy in Catholic Germany of to-day.

The little magazine known as the *TRIDENT*, the review of the Britannia Society of Fribourg (Switzerland) is an extremely lively and useful production. The present number (June, 1932) contains five articles, in addition to reviews, and every one of them is well worth reading. One may call particular attention to Mr. G. M. Turnell's brilliant study "Refuge of Fire" which considers the chief obstacles in the way of the modern world's conversion (in this regard it recalls the *DUBLIN REVIEW*'s series that was mentioned earlier on), and shows how Protestantism "has destroyed the capacity to believe of the larger part" of its adherents. "The alleged failure of Christianity is due to the fact that many people who feel that Protestantism has brought them into the desert are, with all the goodwill in the world, completely unable to make the effort to believe exacted by the Church as a preliminary to conversion. Instead they seek consolation elsewhere; they turn away from religion and create a substitute out of something different. Communism is one of the substitutes. Art is another. Thus, one finds a man like Middleton Murry attaching an altogether exaggerated importance to poetic experience. And Aldous Huxley—the classical example of the 'despairing intellectual' seeks consolation in his intellectual interests" (p. 19). Mr. T. F. Burns's provocative paper "A Dialogue in Retrospect" is always stimulating, even if it does not always command unqualified assent.

The April number of the *JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* (the

July issue, not yet published, is to contain a memoir of one of the editors, Dr. F. E. Brightman, who died on March 31st) opens with a memoir of Professor R. H. Kennett by Professor Stanley Cook, his successor in the Regius Professorship of Hebrew at Cambridge. Dom R. H. Connolly contributes a study on "The *Didache* in relation to the Epistle of Barnabas" and concludes that: "We have seen strong reasons for believing not only that Barnabas is present in his own Two Ways, but that there is matter in the Two Ways of the *Didache* which comes ultimately from his Epistle" (p. 252). He quotes with regard to the "Didachist" Edmund Bishop's remark about a certain monastic chronicler that he was "by no means the innocent that he looks" and that "not in method only; for he was the father of all such as write 'Church Orders' in the name of the Apostles" (p. 253). Mr. E. C. Owen continues his valuable studies of the patristic vocabulary, which are helping to prepare the way for the projected Patristic Lexicon.

THE JOURNAL OF THE PALESTINE ORIENTAL SOCIETY (Vol. XII, Nos. 1-2) is a somewhat specialized affair, but it has at least one article of general interest by Canon W. J. Phythian-Adams on "The Volcanic Phenomena of the Exodus," which argues that "the explosion of some volcanic island or subterranean crater in the Red Sea" may have been the means used by divine Providence for overwhelming Pharaoh's army. Needless to say there is no intention of denying the miraculous element in the narrative. Mr. St. H. Stephan continues his suggestive studies of Palestinian folk-lore with an article on "Palestinian Nursery Rhymes and Songs."

THE QUARTERLY STATEMENT of the Palestine Exploration Fund is full of archaeological data and gives a clear account of the three principal excavations that are taking place in Palestine at the present time. All the accounts are written by the directors of the excavations. So Mr. J. W. Crowfoot writes on the "Expedition to Samaria" and the proposals for 1933; Mr. G. M. FitzGerald describes the ninth season of excavations at Beth-shan, the modern Beisan; and Professor J. Garstang contributes the latest supplementary material in regard of his book *The Foundations of Bible History* on the subject of his third season at Jericho. Professor Garstang gives reasons for thinking that the Jericho of the Bronze Age "perished at some date after 1411 and before 1375 B.C." and that the outer fortifications were not restored until "the second phase of the Iron Age, about 900 B.C., after which there is abundant trace of renewed activity and occupation, lasting, though fitfully, to the Byzantine epoch" (pp. 152-3).

J. M. T. B.

